

# THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

---

No. 3.—OCTOBER—1918.

---

## I.

### CHRISTIANIZING INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS.<sup>1</sup>

HENRY H. RANCK.

"The purification of politics is an iridescent dream," said a United States Senator a few decades ago. There are those who still agree with him touching the conduct of public affairs in city, state, and nation; and they are the ones who hold that purifying, not to speak of Christianizing international politics is a possibility still more remote. After the revelations of the past four years this sordid type of mind is perhaps more convinced than ever of the truth of his position, and who among us but has been not only amazed but dazed and staggered by the workings of the mystery of iniquity? Men who know are saying now that war is worse than hell, and as for the devil, he has been clearly outdone. The situation seems to call for a superdevil. Perhaps we will need a new name altogether for the principle of evil. We might call *it*, or *him*, Kaiser; why not?

The senator, however, who made the above statement was repudiated by his constituency. A fine indignation flamed out against that and similar sentiments. Political morality

<sup>1</sup> Read at the Spiritual Conference of Ministers and Laymen of the Reformed Church at Lancaster, Pa., Tuesday evening, July 23, 1918.

in the United States is now distinctly on a higher plane than in the latter part of the nineteenth century. The world "do move" up toward better things even in this realm, and the primal urge in this gigantic conflict of the nations has not been the evil, aggressive machinations of a military party, but the onward sweep of the eternal tides of God over the hearts of men in human history. The Prussian effort is a magnificent, desperate but futile attempt to keep back the onmoving swell. It is the fight of a lion at bay. The Prussian leaders know that to maintain their privileges they must extend and exert their power. The only way to save their own necks is to get their jackboots on the necks of others. Some of these astute leaders sense the crisis character of the situation—therefore it is "world power or downfall." Believers in the moral order of the universe—in God—know there can be only one ultimate issue to the struggle. "Faith is the victory that overcomes the world."

There are folk even in Germany who know with us precisely who the prime aggressors were and are, in precipitating this world catastrophe. But other nations too, including the United States are not without sin in international dealing. The horror, magnitude, and waste of this war are such that many will no longer ask, "Is Christianity practicable?" It is driven home to the conscience of multitudes that following principles other than Christian is not only impractical but means utter failure and disaster. "The wages of sin is death" has demonstration as never before, and it applies to nations as well as to individuals. Mammon servers are devoured by their own devices. Comparatively few men and no nations ever believed that we can't serve God and mammon. Material success, however attained, has generally been looked on by Church folk as a clear manifestation of divine favor. Increasing numbers are seeing now that to follow Jesus is the only way—even for nations.

"Thy Kingdom come, thy will be done on earth" is the very core of the Master's teaching. Yet through the centuries

of the Christian Church, Protestant as well as Roman and Greek, the Kingdom has been projected into the future heavenly world. The purpose of the Church was to get men to heaven. The chief object in living a godly life was to be qualified for entrance into the future bliss—glorious truths which will never be abandoned—but in spite of constant praying, or perhaps only saying, the Lord's prayer, Jesus' idea that the Kingdom of God is at hand, to be established on the earth here and now, the purpose of the Old Testament idealists, has been looked on not only as impossible, but unscriptural and heretical.

Last May was held in Philadelphia a convention of premillenarians who are excited now about the "Return of our Lord." Prominent religious leaders in America gave utterance there to sentiments like these (I quote from the *Philadelphia Ledger*): "Sometimes, when I hear gentle idiots talking about the world getting better, I wonder if they feel their own pulses. I wouldn't trust my pocket book with any of them." "It is idle to hope for a league of nations that will bring about universal peace; an international court of arbitration must also fail; if these things come to pass, the book of God is not true."

Such sentiments seem almost incredible. We cannot think they are very widely believed. The conduct of those who hold such views is probably better than their faith. Such teaching is fraught with danger to the Kingdom of Christ and to our nation now in its great struggle. It is due to the literal view of the scriptures which has cursed Protestantism since the Reformation period, and from which we are gradually being freed by seminaries having the progressive, truth-loving spirit of our own. We owe a great debt of gratitude to men like Washington Gladden, Lyman Abbott and Walter Rauschenbusch for leadership in applying the principles of Jesus to the various social and political relations of men. The book which has clarified and crystallized our thought more than any other is Rauschenbusch's "Christianizing the Social Order," which

appeared only six years ago. Herein he shows that "Four great sections of our social order—the family, the organized religious life, the institutions of education, the political organization of our nation—have passed through constitutional changes which have made them to some degree part of the organism through which the spirit of Christ can do its work in humanity." He then sets before us with wonderful cogency the unredeemed section of the social order—the realm of economics, business, which is under "the law of tooth and nail." We were a little surprised when he claimed that even a Christian Church may be unchristian, but still more so when our political life was considered Christian at all. The author confessed to some misgivings in moving that this brother be received among the regenerate, but plead on his behalf that he is a newly saved sinner, showing that "Politics has been on the thorny path of sanctification only about a century and a half, and the tattered clothes and questionable smells of the far country still cling to the prodigal,"—"The fundamental redemption of the state took place when special privilege was thrust out of the constitution and theory of our government, and it was based on the principle of personal liberty and equal rights."

Ruschenbusch in this book is discussing the American social order; it is not within its scope to treat international relations. But when it is declared that the fundamental theory of our government is freedom and equal justice to all, by the same token we see that international politics is still in the far country among the groveling swine. Moreover the unregenerate economic order, which it is the chief function of each nation to protect for its own, we see to be the chief source of international troubles.

Humanity is the object of redemption: "The field is the world." We are to "disciple all the nations." Jesus is the judge of all men, which means that the principles of the Master are the standard of men and nations, by which they are approved or condemned. Too long have we viewed the



world as a sinking ship to which we come with life boats and throw out life lines to save whom we can. We must save the ship with all on board, and bend her course to the destined haven. There's a conflict on board now as to who shall sail her and for whom and whither. The ship is not going to be destroyed, but the rival crews and groups of passengers are destroying each other and the gang of pirates, who want to loot the cargo and run the vessel for their own interest and not for the welfare of all, must be made to walk the plank. The old ship in her sailings through the centuries has had a sorry time of it with many a mutiny and bloody conflict as to who should be captain. A lot of the voyagers think it is high time to determine once for all the purpose of her sailing and by the establishment of a wise order and discipline make it possible that serious mutiny shall happen never again. The time has come to Christianize international relations.

By that we mean to make these relations right, in keeping with the moral order. Christianity is revelation of the will of God concerning us. We see God and his purpose in the face of Jesus Christ and from Him and by Him learn the way of life. To Christianize an individual is to make him like, to have him approximate the perfection which we have in Jesus. To Christianize social and political relationships is to apply Christ's principles, recognizing them as the norm of all life in heaven and on earth. What is right is Christian; what is wrong is unchristian everywhere and always. This of course does not exhaust the meaning of Christianity, which is not only a body of principles, but a life of power. We believe in the universality of the moral order because we believe in the Fatherhood of God, in whom we live and move and have our being. Because one God is Father, all men are brethren. "Above all nations is humanity," said Plato, yes, and above all races and class distinctions of men is the eternal human with its kinship to the eternal divine. "All the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." The task of loving across racial and national

boundaries is difficult but not impossible. It has been done by individuals, it needs to be done by the groups themselves. It ought to be done and therefore it must and can be done. As there is a way in the sky for each constellation in its course, so in the intercourse of nations there must be a path for each, that there may be among them a harmony akin to the music of the spheres. The thing to do is for the nations to find the way and then each to walk in it. And the way is none other than the path of righteousness. The Kingdom of God is not one or various things that men often take it to be, "but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit"—and righteousness first. "Seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness" said the Master. It must be the prime quest of nations, for it is the only possible basis of peace. "The work of righteousness shall be peace and the effect of righteousness, quietness and confidence forever" (Jer. 32: 17). Of course such justice and truth can come only when "the spirit is poured forth from on high" and just that is it to Christianize relations, to bring the mind and spirit of Christ into every human contact. "The attempt to establish the social and political relations on a religious basis is the most divine work given to man," says Canon Fremantle.

Nations must learn to respect each other. Too often the feeling of disdain and hate is cultivated. The attitude of suspicion and envy is deliberately inculcated. The first thing taught children in German schools, we are told, is that Germany is a nation surrounded by enemies. Madame de Stael said, "The patriotism of nations ought to be selfish." Of course this means friction and clashing and war. This course has been most frankly and brutally defended by the notorious Prussian writers. The following quotations are from Treitschke and Bernhardi:

"The Christian duty of self-sacrifice for something higher has no existence whatever for the state because there is nothing whatever beyond it in world-history."

"Self-sacrifice for a foreign nation is not only not moral but

it contradicts the idea of self-preservation, which is the highest thing for the state." "Of all political sins that of weakness is the most reprehensible and the most contemptible: it is in politics the sin against the Holy Ghost."

"Christian morality is based on the law of love. This law can claim no significance for the relations of one country to another, since its application to politics would lead to a conflict of duties. . . . Christian morality is personal and social and in its nature cannot be political. . . . It tells us to love our individual enemies but does not remove the conception of enmity."

"War is a biological necessity of the first importance. . . . The law of the stronger holds good everywhere. . . . The right of conquest is universally acknowledged. At first the procedure is pacific. . . . Higher civilization and the correspondingly greater power are the foundations of the right to annexation. . . . The only course left is to acquire the necessary territory by war. It is not the possessor but the victor who then has the right."

Germany is not the only sinner. Not one of the great nations but has been likewise guilty in degree. Still fresh in our minds is the conduct of Belgium in the Congo and the British in South Africa. We of the United States are by no means proud of all our dealings with the Indians, not to speak of Mexico and the Mexican War. Even now there are those among us whose spirit is purely militaristic, identical with that of the Prussians. Note the following quotation from the Navy League as it appeared, and was commented<sup>o</sup>n in *The New Republic* of June 1, last: "A dangerous and insidious movement is under way for doing away with America's national navy at the close of the war and of pooling our navy and the protection of our interests and our national honor in charge of a partnership in which Germany, Austria, Bulgaria and Turkey shall be members—and combined they will have four times as many votes in the cabal as America is to have. In the interest of some platitudinous brotherhood of men we

are being urged to submerge the sovereignty of these United States. . . . At the close of this war there must be a brotherhood of Americans—Americans First, American Business First, the American Navy First.” Rather a surprising sentiment after the frequent expressions of the avowed altruistic aims of the United States and her allies in this war. *The Seven Seas*, the organ of the Navy League had this to say before our entrance into the war (I take this from the writings of Sidney L. Gulick): “World empire is the only logical and natural aim of a nation. The true militarist believes that pacifism is the masculine and humanitarianism is the feminine manifestation of national degeneracy. It is the absolute right of a nation to live to its fullest intensity, to expand, to found colonies, to get richer and richer by any proper means, such as armed conquest, commerce and diplomacy.”

These opinions are not confined to a narrow group or a particular class, as we have all heard from time to time in our intercourse with men. Take the following from the *Washington Herald* of 1915: “All nations are and must be selfish. At the close of the present struggle we shall be in a position in all respects but arms and the will to arm to control the destinies of the terrestrial globe. On the other hand, the European nations, impoverished financially and with their resources of ‘cannon food’ materially depleted, will not only be armed to the teeth, but will have the immense reserves of spiritual vigor that war always begets. We shall look to them very much as a fat, white caterpillar does to a party of hungry ants.

“We shall dispute this leadership either with Britain or Germany, as the case may be, when the opportunity presents itself. That is why we have kept out of the struggle. It is to our advantage that our potential rivals shall weaken each other as much as possible. This is what all our apostles of preparedness have in their hearts; and all the talk that our post-prandial orators and statesmen put forth about our objects being purely defensive and our having no interests in the

eastern hemisphere, and so on, is just so much hypocritical balderhash. We desire to be a great nation and to have our 'place in the sun,' which is just a synonym for 'bossing the show,' and though we are not so truculent or so objectionable about it, our aspirations in this respect are not a whit different from those that Germany has published broadcast to the world.

"Great Britain and the United States going hand-in-hand to lead the world into a warless era is only a beautiful dream. Bombs and dollars are the only things that count today. We have plenty of one. Let us lay in a good supply of the other and blast a path to world leadership as soon as an opportunity presents itself."

We thus see that in the purpose to Christianize the international order we have missionary work right here at home.

That a nation is to have its own way in every situation, with a sovereignty unlimited by none has been the ideal of states. This is the attitude that might makes right. Rattle the sabre if another blocks the way and be ready with army and navy to strike. These are the selfish unbrotherly principles which have so largely prevailed. There is, however, a tremendous sentiment today for the application of the golden rule among the nations—to respect and love and not to hate, to coöperate rather than compete, not to lord it over the weak and grab what we can, but rather help and give each nation, however small, the chance to live its own life.

Each nation like each individual has its peculiar gifts, due to native qualities and past training. It probably has some valuable resource which other nations do not have. Each thus is in a position to contribute to the welfare of all, supplying what another lacks. Bargaining is to be looked on not as obtaining advantage at the expense of another, but the conferring of mutual benefit, in which the spirit of ministering as well as being ministered unto is the thought. The nations need each other and none can live its life unto itself. Each should be benefited by the qualities and wealth of others, and the strong should bear the burdens of the weak. We are glad

to note that genuine disinterested action has not been altogether wanting among the nations, as when the United States returns to China part of the Boxer indemnity for the education of Chinese, and hopeful examples are international agreements to stop the slave trade in Africa and to prohibit the export of alcoholic drinks to primitive peoples.

Honest diplomacy is the demand of the new order. When nations are enemies and envious they are full of suspicion and fear, and fairness and candor are impossible. Fredrick the Great followed the principles of Machiavelli and left these maxims for the guidance of his successors:

"If possible, the powers of Europe should be made envious against one another, in order to give occasion for a coup when the opportunity arises. I understand by the word policy that one must make it his study to deceive others. That is the way to get the better of them."—"Form alliances only in order to sow animosity."

These principles mean secret diplomacy, covert understandings and dark intrigues, and that solemn treaties are only scraps of paper. They make espionage necessary. To the spy, truthfulness, friendship, honor, and honesty are nothing. The end always justifies the means. In the present status of international morality every country has its spy system which it holds in high esteem as a part of its defense, and gives the more euphonious name of "secret service." None can afford to be caught napping, therefore the hidden designs of the others must be found out. It becomes a shameful fabric of deception, in which otherwise good men feel forced to acquiesce. The great Cavour remarked to a friend after doing some act in Italy's interest that if they did such a thing in private life they would be accounted scoundrels.

In addition to the public treaties among European states, kings and emperors have been wont to have secret agreements, pledging their nations. Various rumors get afloat. Chauvinists play upon the fears of the people. One nation or group tries to forestall or circumvent the other. Here are high explosives which some day are sure to be détonated.



In the United States, treaties are ratified by the Senate after being negotiated by the Department of State. In the steps and processes of discussion there are no doubt phases which must be withheld from the public, but they are conducted by persons trusted by and responsible to the people. We believe with Senator Borah in "open diplomacy." One of the gains of this great war certainly ought to be an increase in popular control of international affairs. Says Elihu Root in his foreword to Viscount Ishii's "Imperial Japanese Mission to the United States, 1917": "The central vice of the old system of diplomacy in camera has been the control of secret selfish policies of aggrandisement in which the interests of the popular mass play little or no part. The danger in popular diplomacy rests in popular misunderstanding of national rights and duties, and the suspicions and resentment and violent impulses resulting from popular misunderstanding." Speaking further of the vague and mistaken impressions the Japanese on the one hand and the United States folk on the other have had as to the purpose and motive of the other country, he says: "This does not apply to the two governments. Nothing could be more frank and considerate and friendly than the relations between them. They have not misunderstood each other because they have had the means and the wish to inform themselves, and they have understood and trusted each other." The honest determination to be fair, understand and get on together, whether among people or states will not prove futile. The principle expressed with reference to Russia we would see everywhere applied: "Millions for open light, not one cent for dark intrigue." Oscar S. Straus says, "The world will never be safe for democracy so long as the diplomacy of states is under the cloak of secrecy."

That "the world must be made safe for democracy" is the President's glowing phrase, defining our's and our allies' purpose in the Great War. We have here the basic principle in the program to Christianize international relations. We

are apt to think of a form of government in using this term, but it is much more. In the words of Lyman Abbott: "Democracy is not a mere form of government. It is a religious faith. It is a spirit of life—a spirit of mutual regard for each others interest and mutual respect for each others opinions; it is government by public opinion; it is liberty, equality, fraternity, in the institutions of religion, industry, and education, as well as in government; in a word it is human brotherhood."

In its political aspect it is "government of the people, for the people, by the people," which implies that back of it is the free spontaneous, unhampered activity of human souls in ways that do not trench on like liberty in thought and action on the part of every other. Democracy stands for the individual and the unfolding of all his powers,—for the human soul in its integrity and uniqueness against the whole world. A true democratic government, whatever be its form or name, will enhance and not hinder the self realization of its citizens. "The sabbath was made for man," said the Master, and so was government and every other institution. A democratic government will always be the great agent of the people's interests and rights. "The first article in the creed of democracy is the belief that the pearl of great price is personality," says Robert Goldsmith.

There is an individuality of national and racial groups also, and it should be preserved for the sake of those who have it as well as for the enrichment of all mankind. Oh, what a crime against God and man to crush and mutilate it to fit a procrustean bed! Wherever a racial unit is forbidden the free exercise of its distinctive customs, social tendencies and manifest rights there is bound to be unrest and incipient revolution. Man was made for freedom and it is an index of his inherent nobility that he has nearly always been ready to fight and die for it. This knotty question of nationalism is one of the most fundamental in the Great War. And it centers in the kaleidoscopic arena of Austria and the Balkans. We

sympathize with every group in its yearning for liberty and autonomy. The trouble has been when one group attained the hegemony it straightway lorded it over those in its power. Somehow when one nationality enjoys freedom it must learn to accord the same boon of selfdirecting development to every other it touches.

Autocracy is the inveterate foe of democracy. As the two cannot get on together in a nation, neither can they in the world. A despotism with its paternalism may be very efficient but its achievement is inevitably at the expense of liberty. The primary purpose of democracy is not the immediate accomplishment of certain definite external ends but the full education of citizens, the making of men. It is the difference between darkness and light. The one is wrong, the other is right. Edward Howard Griggs says: "Paternalism ends in social hierarchy, materially prosperous, but cast ridden and without soul. Democracy ends in abolishing of castes, equality of opportunity with freest individual initiative—the finest flowering of the human spirit. . . . Man for the state means autocracy and imperialism: man for mankind is the soul of democracy." A recognition and progressive realization of these principles connoted by this term democracy, in nations and among nations, are the tokens of the purpose to walk in the Christian path.

"The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof." That means that the material resource of the earth is not for the exclusive ownership and use of the energetic pioneer who preëmpts it or the shrewd exploiter who manages to get legal possession of it, but it is here for the benefit of all men, for God is no respecter of persons. The love of money is a root of all kinds of evil in the everyday affairs of men, and the economic question is undoubtedly the tap root of international difficulty. We note how largely politics and legislative activity have to do with business affairs, taxation, material interests and prosperity and when differences arise in the relationships of nations, they are nearly always over problems

of immediate or remote economic concern. When a man's pocketbook is converted we feel that the sanctifying process has gotten far along with him. Can we Christianize the money power of the world? This last citadel must be taken by the conquering Christ if the nations are to crown Him King.

There is a great truth, though not the whole truth, in economic determinism. "Remove the economic factors leading to war, give men more than enough and the chief incentive to war disappears. . . . Pan-Germanism was the intellectual and emotional expression of an economic *malaise*," says Walter E. Weyl. The clamorers for war, however, are not the hungry, but rather the overfed plutocrats who are never satisfied. The wise man might have added a fifth to those who never say, Enough—the folk inoculated with the money lust germ. The promoters of *Real-politik* in Germany were not the social democrats. Before the Great War there were fewer hungry mouths in Germany than in certain other great nations whom she is now fighting. There was, however, a hunger for power, success and dominion, and a feeling that she had the military efficiency to secure it. We can realize how such a strong ambitious nation could feel regarding the fact that the choice material prizes of the earth had been grabbed by other nations and she, coming late, had only a few indifferent leavings. With an increasing population which she would fain keep intact as a thing of power and glory, with an efficiency in material things excelling every other great nation, she claimed she could make better use of resources than any other, therefore she had a right to expand and "exist" by the exercise of any means whatsoever. Had not England attacked Denmark in 1806 under the plea of national necessity? Had not other nations done the same? How about the United States in dealing with the Indians and with Mexico seventy years ago? Many justify the United States on the plea that she makes better use of territory than the Indians or Mexicans. That is exactly Germany's argument.

H. G. Wells, in "Mr. Britling sees it Through," discerns a truth here when he sets Germany with her effectiveness over against England and Russia with their laxity and indolence and says, "God is not on the side of those who keep the untilled field," the message of the bomb is "forget not order and the real," and he sees even in Germany's savage assault—"after all a sort of stupid righteousness."

It is easy to assert the principle that natural wealth belongs to the whole human family; but now that nations and individuals possess, how is it possible to effect peacefully an equitable readjustment. In the priest code of the Old Testament we read of the year of Jubilee, when all land was to return to the original owner or his representatives according to the supposed early allotment among the tribes—a beautiful recognition of the principle that the land of the people is for all and not only for a few shrewd land lords. It is not likely, however, that it was ever carried out in practice every fifty years. Verily in a high spiritual sense we could sing "The year of Jubilee is come," if after this war mankind generally would gladly recognize the principle and determine to live it out, that all the earth is for all the people, and then have an approximately fair distribution amongst the nations and peoples of the earth. This, however, would involve a change in human nature too radical to hope for. It is not too much of a dream to hope that within each nation may be realized something of the program of reconstruction for England, presented a few months ago by a committee of the British Labor Party who insist that a new social order must presently be built up on "a deliberately planned coöperation in production and distribution for the benefit of all who participate by hand or by brain, on a systematic approach towards a healthy equality of material circumstances."

The difficulties are mountain high as we consider economic questions in their international bearing. It is supreme folly to blink them; they must be studied and dealt with wisely; but we must and some time will have righteousness even here.

The tariff we readily see becomes a profound moral question, and we commend to statesmen who have world sympathies John Biglow's little book "The Folly of Building Temples of Peace with Untempered Mortar." He says, "Let us combine to lay the foundations of an enduring peace by exterminating our tariffs upon imports and its nest of rattlesnakes, the custom houses," Coöperation and reciprocity among nations is not only right but a safer and more profitable course than competition and economic war. Says Sidney L. Gulick, "Should not all tariff walls be taken down so that artificially developed industries which are therefore essentially expensive, may cease, and each land and people be enabled to contribute to the whole world that which it can produce most effectively?" We must abolish privilege everywhere if we would have universal social justice.

Back of the conflict in Europe are the clashings of colonial enterprise in Africa and Asia. More than forty billions of dollars were invested over seas by the capitalists of the great nations before the war. The resources in lands of backward peoples must not lie unused, neither must they be exploited to fill the coffers of the strong. The weak and undeveloped peoples are not to be treated as slaves, but as children having rights in the family of nations. Let them be under tutelage in their adolescent period that they may in due time enjoy and use their inheritance for the benefit of all. The peaceable partition of the unexploited regions has been suggested. A sort of territorial system for the maintenance of order and the guidance and training of non-adult peoples until they are qualified for self-government under the joint supervision of the civilized nations is a plan worth considering. If the prevailing sentiment of the nations reaches the point where it is determined on fairness to all peoples the world around—and it is rapidly moving thitherward—even the colonial question will be solved right.

"The freedom of the seas" is an axiomatic principle in the consideration of world justice. Russian ships must have way



through the Dardanelles. If the Austrian monarchy is found worthy of existence at all after the war, it and Serbia too must have access to the Adriatic. As the natural straits are highways for all, so the artificial straits—the great inter-oceanic canals—must be so conducted that they will be the free channels of the world's commerce.

Big business has been moving rapidly from the stage of competition to that of combination and monopoly. Capital is fluid, potentially international. The long arm of business enterprise reaches out across the continents. Investors in one nation have stakes in the prosperity of another, and thus, as it were, "give hostages to peace." Says Walter E. Weyl, we are "today still in the full economic development that makes for war, but also at the beginning of the economic trend toward peace." The very logic of events is for mankind's welfare; verily the stars in their courses fight against Sisera and every human foe. Are we not finding peace and coöperation profitable? If the giant self interest is being harnessed to the car of mutual benefit, surely it is dawn of the day when there will be "new heavens and a new earth."

I have thus dwelt at length on the great principles of righteousness which must be recognized and progressively realized in the conduct of nations in the process of Christianizing international relations—all men are brothers and individually and in groups must show mutual appreciation of worth; international dealing whether touching compacts made or in the negotiating of differences must be in integrity and truth; the principle of democracy must obtain—liberty under law for all; the natural wealth of the world belongs to the whole human family and commercial enterprise is to be conducted for human welfare. These principles must be preached until they are prevaillingly believed in, but a great step must be taken to make them universally effective—we must organize international government.

A government of some kind is a fundamental necessity among men. It is a requirement of the moral order. "The

powers that be are ordained of God." Take that literally and deny the right of revolution, as Luther did, and we play into the hands of the holders of privilege and power and permit chains to be forged on us. Recognize the principle involved and we will try to frame the best instrument possible for law and order. "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's." Some sort of a Cæsar we must have. We prefer the democratic variety representing all the people, rather than a few or one. In the order of human events, international government of some kind is ordained of God, for the protection of all and the furthering of their welfare. This doctrine is being preached. Well may we pray for its realization; but we will not fall accidentally upon a successful scheme of international order, we must plan and work for it. It is a stupendous task, bristling with difficulties. It is consummate folly to think it is easy. Immortal honors await the Jefferson who can frame and have accepted a Declaration of International Interdependence, and the Madison who can constitute successfully even though in crude beginnings the Federation of the World. Is not the supreme call of the hour for this sublime statesmanship in behalf of the Kingdom of God? "In time of peace prepare for war." Let us say rather, "In time of war prepare for peace." A negative peace will not suffice. A sense of the horror and folly even of this war will not deter men forever from resorting to arms. We must have the international machinery to settle difficulties because of which the sword now is drawn. It would be little less than calamitous to have the representatives of the now warring nations come to the council table of peace with no plan of world organization. Each nation would then scheme to get for itself the most possible out of the situation. Old alliances would dissolve, new *ententes* would be formed and the world of nations start out on the same old path toward even a worse holocaust a generation or two hence. Says Lord Bryce, we now have "the opportunity never presented to Christian nations before of making a final decision between two courses."

Hitherto the nations have been apart, suspicious, cold, somewhat callous. Our allies are now fused into a great sense of union in the flames of conflict. Says Hon. T. Henley, M.P., New South Wales, in a charming little book entitled "Christendom and the Coming Peace": "The seven times heated furnace of national affliction gives the molten metal of sacrifice and sympathy from which can be cast a band strong enough to bind the nations to a lasting world peace."

To win the war is the one task before the allies. This is the thing we must do with the concentration of all our powers. True; yet a better way to put it is this—"Allied to win the world peace"; and if we are to be "United to maintain it," we must have plans where with to attain our end. If the metal is fluid in the furnace to cast the bonds of enduring peace, the moulds should be ready. It would seem high time for the pattern makers to be busy. Perhaps even now the metal is ready to be poured. The Continental Congress of the thirteen colonies was convening several years before the Declaration of Independence and continued throughout the Revolution and thereafter. Its tentative principles of action and "Articles of Confederation" were developed into the permanent constitution of the United States in which there are now forty-eight commonwealths. A score of nations are now allied against the Central Powers. We have the great preponderance of territory and population, for the heart of Russia is with us, as is the popular sympathy of the neutral states. Could a more convenient season for organizing a congress of nations come than now—at least a nucleus of the chief allies to which we might hope others would gather in due time, also even neutrals and ultimately our foes. Such a move might be a great war measure, showing to the rank and file of the people who are now our enemies just what we are striving for. A start in international government must be made some time. May the great leaders of our allies, who talk about these things, have the wisdom to know the opportune time whenever it really has come, and take the great initiative.

There have been various federative efforts on a small scale in the course of history running back as far as the Amphictionie Council in Greece several centuries Before Christ. The greatest and most successful is of course the United States of America, which will give encouragement at least for the far more difficult task of forming some sort of a United States of the world. The idea of a federation of nations and discussions as to ways and means to effect it have been presented from time to time ever since the fifteenth century, in the latter part of which probably the first definite proposal was made by a ruler to this end—by Podiebrad, King of Bohemia, the land of John Hus. We all vividly recall the peace discussions of the last twenty years, the two Hague Peace Conferences held and the third to have been convened in 1915, when plans under way for a world tribunal would probably have been made effective. This in near prospect with the rising tide of sentiment for democracy and against militarism, outside of Germany and also within, undoubtedly was a great factor giving decision to the Prussian leaders to strike when they did. It was for them then or never.

A most notable proposal for a congress of nations was that presented by the master philosopher of the modern era, Immanuel Kant, in an immortal little monograph entitled "Eternal Peace," and in kindred political essays.

These writings are remarkable not only for their prophetic contents, but also as coming from a Prussian, for Kant lived in Koenigsberg in the days of Frederick the Great. He was the great apostle of the categorical imperative, and he saw by the inexorable logic of the moral order that the only way for nations to get on rightly and peaceably together was by some sort of a federative arrangement. Note some of the theses which he discusses:

"The greatest practical problem for the human race, to the solution of which it is compelled by nature, is the establishment of a civil society, universally administering right according to law."

"This problem is likewise the most difficult of its kind, and it is the latest to be solved by the human race."

"The problem of the establishment of a perfect civil constitution is dependent on the problem of the regulation of the external relations between the states conformably to law; and without the solution of this latter problem it cannot be solved."

"A philosophical attempt to work out the universal history of the world according to the plan of nature in its aiming at a perfect civil union must be regarded as possible, and as even capable of helping forward the purpose of nature."

"Standing armies shall be entirely abolished in the course of time."

"No state shall intermeddle by force with the constitution or government of another State."

"No state at war with another shall adopt such modes of hostility as would necessarily render mutual confidence impossible in a future peace; such as the employment of assassins (*percussores*) or poisoners (*venefici*), the violation of a capitulation, the instigation of treason and such like."

"The law of nations shall be founded on a federation of free states."

"The civil constitution in every state shall be republican."

"What we mean to propose is a general congress of nations. . . . Such a congress and such a league are the only means of realizing the idea of a true public law."

To the Kaiser and his associates, admirers of things German, and more particularly Prussian, we commend these sentiments, and the essays from which they are taken for their thoughtful consideration.

In "the definitive articles of an eternal peace between states" the first is: "The civil constitution of every state shall be republican," says Kant. This is the identical thought of our president stated thus, "A steadfast concert of peace can never be maintained except by a partnership of democratic nations," for "the menace of peace and freedom lies in the existence of autocratic governments backed by organized force

which is controlled by their will and not by the will of the people." There is such a thing as "a German peace," which is the same only worse than the historic Roman peace. We know exactly what it is. Let the Kaiser speak and be condemned out of his own mouth—as reported a few months ago: "We desire to live in friendship with neighboring people, but the victory of German arms must first be recognized."

This desired league of nations can never be consummated as long as autocracy is tolerated on the planet. A league of autocrats playing into each other's hands to maintain their sceptres and lording it over the people, the world has seen more than enough of. The so-called Holy Alliance of one hundred years ago was inaugurated with promises of blessing and liberty to the people. But the leaders were reactionary and the people were fooled, as they always are when they allow self-appointed irresponsible masters to govern them. The democratic spirit and purpose in all the constituents of the league of nations is essential to its success.

A magna charta of the righteous principles of international government as the basis of a growing body of international law; a permanent supreme court of arbitration for the settlement of questions on the basis of accepted principles; a council of investigation and conciliation to deal with non-arbitrable cases; an international legislature to enact necessary new laws and perhaps an executive to enforce them; the understanding to exercise economic and social boycott and an international police force against a recalcitrant member of the league—these and other agencies seem necessary elements in a world government to be tested and tried out in the process of Christianizing International Relations.

The principle involved which we here apply to nations is stated in simple fashion by Jesus in Mat. 18: 15-17: "If thy brother sin against thee, go show him his fault between thee and him alone; and if he hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother"—Diplomacy;—"But if he hear thee not, take with thee one or two more, that at the mouth of two witnesses or



three every word may be established"—Conciliation, "And if he refuse to hear them tell it unto the Church" or assembly—and as applied to the nations this would mean the group representing them in interpreting the common law—this is Arbitration; "and if he refuse to hear the Church (or assembly) also, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican"—Non-intercourse—for that was the attitude of the Jew to the non-Jew and the despised tax-gatherer. The cutting off of all dealings and communication—business, social and intellectual, would be a formidable weapon which alone in most cases would bring the answer without resort to arms. But conciliation and arbitration failed to avert this Great War, it will be said. They did not fail. The aggressors refused to submit the original question to negotiation. I have it directly from Hon. John Barrett, Director General of the Pan-American Union in Washinton, the account of his expounding in full detail the Union to Mr. Balfour, who explained the matter to the British Cabinet, and they were all quite agreed that had there been a Pan-European Union of similar comprehensive scope and high purpose there "might never have been an European War."

There is in the world today undoubtedly much favorable opinion toward this great political move, but sentiment cannot do the work of organization. We must have the machinery to make these ideas effective. Perhaps we must be content to go slow. Better one step successfully taken than too much attempted and failure. This is the thought with the leaders in the League to Enforce Peace, which some think would better be named the "League to Enforce Pause." This does not forbid nations going to war but that their difficulties must come before the constituted tribunals of peaceful settlement first, on penalty of attack by the international armies. This seems a sane, practical approach to the problem. The international government must endeavor to correct maladjustment which time produces due to unequal increases in population, etc., on account of which nations go to war. If it attempts to maintain the status quo forever against the expanding de-

mands of virile peoples it is foredoomed to failure. There is truth in this statement of Dr. Weyl, "The best heritage that the world can have is not a perfect constitution, but a feasible principle of change." Stability and flexibility in wise balance is the need.

It is our high privilege as preachers and prophets of the new age to see the vision, proclaim the principles and point the way, helping to create the international mind and the public opinion necessary to back up the experts and statesmen to the great practical task. With the manifest opportunities occasioned by this Great War, may the international leaders not be found wanting in constructive effort. Perhaps sooner than we even fondly hope, we may realize the world status, where

"The war drum throbbed no longer and the battle-flags were furled  
In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the World.  
There the common sense of most shall hold a fretful realm in awe,  
And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapped in universal law."

WASHINGTON, D. C.

## II.

### THE WAR AND CHURCH UNITY.

RUFUS W. MILLER.

Our Lord declares "The sons of this world or age are for their own generation wiser than the sons of light."

Will this declaration prove true with respect to the lessons of the war as they bear upon the question of Church Unity? May we not hope that this world war may clarify and purify the vision and motive power of Christian leaders and churches and, like the burning lightning and awful thunder which awakens new life in nature, prove to be the dynamic by which the spirit of God will produce greater Christian and Church unity?

There are *four* outstanding fundamentals which the war is teaching us:

1. The ideals of democracy based upon brotherhood, service and freedom. On the battlefield, behind the lines, among the starving villagers in the pestilence-ridden districts, in the home of comfort, with its food conservation and Red Cross efforts, the spectacle is presented, of service not for self but for another. Charity and brotherly love has been manifested as never before. The response to human need has been magnificent and matchless. The war has focused the attention of the world upon the great pressing need of democracy. The demand for the democratization of the nations that the peace of the world may not again be menaced by the will of irresponsible aristocracies is steadily growing. The current is set strongly toward democracy in all parts of the world and is likely to set still more strongly toward it after the war.

This cannot be a matter of indifference to Christianity and the Church; for Christianity is a democratic religion, stand-

ing for the brotherhood of all men, high and low, rich and poor, bound and free. True, it has gotten on quite well with all sorts of aristocracies simply because it has limited the range of its application.

2. The second great factor which the war is stressing is the need of *internationalism*. More and more as the war goes on are the ablest minds calling for some form of a "league of nations" pledged to settle disputes by judicial and Christian methods and by the application of ethics to the relationships of nations, as it has been practiced among individuals for a hundred years. Some of the most prominent English statesmen and many of our prominent American statesmen and thinkers have everywhere been saying that: "Unless some Concert of Nations," "League of Nations," "Partnership of Nations," composed of the great powers and all others that may come in, shall be achieved, the result of this war has been in vain. It has been in every message and address of the President of the United States, since the famous address to the Senate on January 22, 1917. In that address he says that this war must end in a "Concert of Nations" and in his famous Des Moines address he expressed it forcefully: "I pray God that if this contest have no other result it will at least have the result of creating some sort of joint guarantee of peace on the part of the great nations of the world."

The war is causing us to see that the fundamental assumption of all the nations for centuries—that every nation is a law unto itself—is a fallacy and great wrong. The idea that the nation is and must be the final and supreme arbiter of all matters in which its own interests are involved and that force is the only method by which national disputes can be decided, is burning itself into the convictions of the nations as, somehow or other, a mistake. Israel Zangwill, in a discerning discussion of the "Principles of Nationalities," well states the correct idea that: "The brotherhood of the peoples is not barred by the pluralities of patriotisms. It takes two men to make one brother. Internationalism, so far then from

being the antithesis of Nationalism, undoubtedly requires nations to inter-relate."<sup>1</sup>

3. The third fundamental fact which the war emphasizes anew is that the education of the school and college is all-important. It was put truly and tersely in an editorial in the *Outlook*: "Autocracy has not been imposed upon Germany by the sword; it has been wrought in Germany by the school-master." Is it not plain that the philosophy, the purpose and the policy which have prevailed among German leaders and which have been systematically cultivated among the people, is responsible for the present world struggle? It was a great German, Humboldt, who said: "Whatever you would put into the State you must first put into the schools" and it was he who made the choice of the German gymnasium dependent upon the approval of the crown. Prince Von Buelow assures us that it is due, not to educational caprice but to the logic of historical facts that in the first instance the German school boy learns the main outlines of his country's history as a history of war. Thus it has come to pass that the German nation sets its faith in its strength above its faith in its ideals and the State Church in Germany becomes a passive, if not a willing instrument, in the hands of the State, to create obedient subjects and loyal supporters of the crown.

On the other hand, in England and America, if not elsewhere, better ideals of life cultivated in the schools, have come to be dominating elements and it is a truism to say that the world war is clearly seen to be a battle for the mastery of certain ideals of life and those ideals are forged and fashioned in the educational institutions of the world by the teachers sent forth from college halls. The war was made in German schools, but victory will come to the ideals of service and brotherhood taught in English and American schools.

4. From the welter of world war we have come to see more clearly than ever, the value and power of organization and of united effort. Germany is efficient because it has been thor-

<sup>1</sup> Page 98.

oughly organized from top to bottom to make one great enginery of war and the Allies muddled through innumerable difficulties and are still struggling in the effort to unite and properly coördinate their forces, for the victory that must come, but which has been delayed because of divisions and independent and unrelated action.

Will the war teach the leaders of the churches that they have failed for much the same reason that the allied nations have failed up to this moment, because they have been wretchedly divided?

Now applying these four fundamental factors which the war is emphasizing, to the present situation in the Christian churches of the world, and particularly in our own land, let us ask ourselves: What of Church Unity? Let us first of all take a glimpse at the terrible duplication of denominational effort in our land. Few, if any, know the facts, but the facts available are sufficiently abundant to stress the need for a remedy.

A few years ago the Commission on Church and Country Life of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America stated that for the best results in towns and open country there should not be more than one church and trained pastor to a thousand of the population, except where the population of an entire township was less than this. What are the facts? The United States Religious Census of 1906 shows that in Alabama there was an average of 1 Evangelical church to every 248 people; Arkansas 1 to every 293; Florida 1 to every 249; Kentucky 1 to every 362; North Carolina 1 to every 254, and even in great Texas 1 to every 400. In 7 of the Southern States the average was 1 church to every 256 people and for the South as a whole, 1 to every 319 people; in other words, the average is more than 3 churches to every 1,000 people, of whom only one third are church members. The bearing of these facts on the size, growth and financial support of churches is evident. In Asia and Africa there are today country districts with a population of 10,000,000 with



one resident missionary among them. In America we have multiplied ministers for ourselves until in the South—and the situation is practically the same throughout the other states of the nation—we have an average of one evangelical minister to every 470 of the people, while the whole Protestant world is sending to China one minister to every 200,000 of the people. The Department of Church and Country Life of the Home Mission Board of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, in connection with other agencies, made an exhaustive investigation of four sections of Ohio, taking the average of about five counties, from the north-eastern, northwestern, southeastern, southwestern sections of the State that every field of service might be thoroughly represented and, including in it, the open country and all towns and villages of 2,500 population and under.

A study of the 1,515 churches in 19 counties showed that where the membership is 1-25, 2 per cent. of the churches are growing; 26-50, 17 per cent. of the churches are growing; 51-100, 48 per cent. of the churches are growing; 101-150, 58 per cent. of the churches are growing; 151-200 and over, 79 per cent. of the churches are growing. The report says: "The similarity with which the increase of efficiency and ability to survive parallels the increase in membership, is very striking."

It was further found that with churches enjoying the full time of a minister, 60 per cent. were growing while with those with one quarter of his time or less, only 26 per cent. were growing. The report finds that in settled and mature communities 80 per cent. of the churches, having 50 or less members, are losing ground and that in such communities until a church has at least 100 members, does it have an even chance to grow. It names "over-churching" and the non-residency of ministers as the chief troubles.

Thousands of churches over our land are suffering because the average membership is small by reason of overduplication of churches. One half the Evangelical churches of America

have less than 65 members, in each congregation nearly two thirds are women and a considerable proportion are young people leaving a handful of men to bear the chief brunt of its support. These churches cannot afford a resident pastor because not one of them can support a resident pastor and no three or four of them in the same community can unite to support one because they belong to different denominations. As Dr. Egbert W. Smith, Secretary of the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions of the Southern Presbyterian Church, well says: "A selfish policy of denominationalism is fulfilling the word of Moses to several of the tribes of Israel who selfishly settled down to the enjoyment of the captured portion of the land leaving the larger task unaccomplished. He assured them they would be committing a sin, 'if ye will not go, all of you armed over Jordan until the land be subdued before the Lord then, behold, ye have sinned and be sure your sin will find you out.'"

Are not the churches in America which have selfishly settled down into a Christianized portion of the world, receiving their punishment? We believe the churches are. Our sin has found us out in the hardships it entails upon the Christian ministers. They are the chief sufferers and, alas, they are perhaps the greatest obstacle in the way of overcoming the evil. According to government statistics the average salary of ministers in America is \$663.00; less than the average wages of stablemen, hod carriers or of day laborers at the present time. Where a fraction of over 1,000 people must support three churches, where several ministers must be paid where one should suffice, not one receives a living support. In the investigation of 100 of the smaller towns in Massachusetts it was found the average salary paid in towns of one church was \$874; with 2 churches \$687; with 3 churches \$473. Our sin is finding us out in the economic waste and lack of return that marks the present system. The writer has in mind a number of country communities and small towns in Pennsylvania. For instance; where conditions like the fol-

lowing obtain. A town of 600 with a Methodist church, a Lutheran, a Presbyterian, a United Presbyterian, a Reformed Church and one or two other small congregations, with a few members each. Pastors of these churches, in several cases, preach at two or three other points and three receive aid from the general church body to which they belong. The faithful few strain themselves to pay for part of the minister's time and for fuel, light and repairs for their one-room church, or perhaps a little better building. All honor to them—but what do they get in return? A fraction of the service of an absentee minister who is not and cannot be a pastor to them, infrequent services thinly attended, a Sunday School too small to generate enthusiasm, a poorly equipped building, a chronic sense of struggle and failure—a church too weak to exert and command influence in the community.

The present system develops denominational prejudices in the small communities. It leads to self-absorption; and not only in town and country districts but also in our cities, we find numberless churches struggling to live, to exist, to keep their heads above water. They are much like a certain rare bird which its keepers had kept alive with difficulty, and which, finally, to their great delight, laid an egg, but when the chick was hatched, the parent promptly ate it. Tens of thousands undoubtedly produce eggs; often at the cost of heroic effort, but which most of them are compelled to eat themselves.

Our sin has found us out because the church has used creeds as "big sticks" with which to compel *all* men to believe what *some* men have believed. Creeds are necessary as proper sign boards but the over-emphasis of creeds has tended to intellectualize religion.

One of the first things that a man is asked to do when he presents himself at the door of the church is to give intellectual assent to the creed of the church. There are few churches with which one may unite unless he can meet the creedal test and this test is perhaps both too severe and too easy; too exacting and not exacting enough. Intellectually, it

is too exacting. It has led to innumerable divisions. It has led to confused thinking such as Donald Hankey describes in a "Student in Arms." He points out that the average "Tommy" who, before the war was a working man, does not associate the virtues of unselfishness and charity with Christianity. He thinks that Christianity consists in believing the Bible and setting up to be better than your neighbor. By believing the Bible he means that you must be better than your neighbors which means—not drinking, not swearing and probably, not smoking; being close-fisted with your money, avoiding the companionship of doubtful characters and refusing to acknowledge that such have any claim upon you."<sup>2</sup>

This reminds one of the thousand and one demands of the law and the impressive ritual and complicated theology of the Jews of our Lord's time. To these heavy laden ones Jesus came with a few simple but tremendous ethical demands and with a religion so simple that a little child could apprehend it.

Our sins has found us out in putting the burden of too severe intellectual credal test on men's minds. For some men it has made church membership impossible. Abraham Lincoln once said: "I cannot, without mental reservation, give assent to a long and complicated creed and catechism but if any church will simply ask assent of Jesus' summary of the law, 'thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy mind and with all thy strength and thy neighbor as thyself,' that church I will gladly join."

These words of the great American are in harmony with the lessons which the war is teaching us. If, intellectually, the creedal test is too exacting, ethically, it is not exacting enough. What was Jesus' test? He said: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of God but he that doeth the will of my father." With Him, the final test is the moral and religious test. Not, do you accept the doctrine but this—do you do His will? Not that ye call me God but this—"I was hungry, did you give me to eat; I was

<sup>2</sup> Page 109.

thirsty, did you give me to drink; I was in prison, did you visit me? I was sick, did you minister unto me?" The command; "If any man would could after me let him deny himself and take up his cross daily and follow me." "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness."

Thank God that the present state of Christian thought and feeling recognizes the demands for the coming of the kingdom in the spirit of the common life. The spirit of brotherhood and of manly and resolute Christian living and service, of social betterment and recognition of God's nearness to everyday living.

The life of service, not a creed, is the real test. What a man does, not what he professes. What he is, not what he has. The war is teaching us the necessity of applied religion, not theological religion; and in the trenches, on the battle fronts, in our camps and cantonments, Greek, Roman Catholic and Protestant Christian are coming to see that even in matters of creed there are the universally accepted essentials—God, Personality, the Incarnation, Human Brotherhood in a Divine Sonship, Sin and the Connection between Religion and Conduct as Cause and Effect, Salvation, a Saviour and Eternal Life,—the Holy Scripture as the revealed Word of God, Service the Inspiring Duty of every believer; Prayer, through which we have access to God; Fellowship with God in Christ begun on earth and continued through all eternity—and the Holy Catholic or Christian Church—a body of Christians, composed of all those in every land who profess this faith and witness it to the world in worship and sacraments and the works of God for humanity.

These essential verities of Christianity suggest no denominational distinctions. True, men may differ in relative emphasis and in form of statement but, after all, differences of this kind are subordinate. They do not justify the perpetuation of divisional walls which exaggerate their relative importance and at the same time obscure the central truths that are held in common.

This brings us face to face with the question of Church Unity. In considering the present situation we need to remember what Dr. Philip Schaff so well said: "If by church unity is meant agreement in all matters pertaining to religious authority and administration then the Apostolic church did not have it. If, however, by church unity it meant devotion to Christ as the Son of God and the Redeemer of the world and a life conformed to His precepts and example, then the Apostolic church had it."

The limitations of this paper do not permit of even a brief, comprehensive review of the history of church unity from this point of view. Unquestionably there were differences of opinion between the early leaders of the church. The Council at Jerusalem, held about 51 A.D. seems to have recognized a sort of parochial division of the world into two classes—Gentile and Judaic and to have committed the gospel of one to Paul and of the other to Peter. This assignment of duties, however, did not invalidate the common unity of the church. I think we are agreed that it is conceded by practically all church historians of note that, so far as organization and administration are concerned, the early church developed naturally the three-fold form of church polity which now obtains in the Christian church; namely, Congregational, democratic or Presbyterian and Episcopal polity. It is certain that the early church possessed no central ecclesiastical authority. From a study of the early church and the development of the church since then, there have come to pass three theories of church unity as to organization. The first centers in Christ alone; the second in the Bishop and the third in the Pope. In common practice it would seem to be safe to say that Protestant churches, and to a certain extent Roman Catholic churches of the present, at least in America, present a combination of these three forms of church government. In the Episcopal church the Bishop performs certain functions, yet, as a matter of fact, there is a great deal of congregationalism in the particular church and a great deal of Presbyterianism in



the general organization of the church. In the other Protestant bodies, board secretaries, moderators, district superintendents exercise practically the influence and perform the work of the bishops of the Episcopal church with the exception of the rite of confirmation and the laying of ordaining hands upon a minister.

If democracy is to become the real form of civil government throughout the world it is plain that the Christian churches of the world, like the Christian churches of America, will be vitally affected in their form of church government. It is likewise plain that if nationalism is to sustain new relations and assume new obligations, as well as receive new restrictions by means of Internationalism, the Christian churches of the world will be powerfully influenced toward a sane Internationalism.

Moreover, if there is to be a lasting internationalism and a League of Nations, the Christian Church must furnish the inspiration. A "League of Nations" holds the promise of the future for Christianity. Through it once more will be realized the ideal so finely stated in an anonymous writing of the second century of the Christian era: "As the soul holds the body together so Christians hold the world together; God has assigned them this illustrious position which it were unlawful for them to forsake."

It is well, also, to remember that the present world trend toward democracy and internationalism affords the church an opportunity to recover its international character. Dr. William Pierson Merrill has well said recently: "Time was when the church was an international organization. Say what we may in criticism of the church in the Middle Ages there was this magnificent fact about it; that it was a super-national organization calling for a loyalty greater than that paid to any separate nation or state.

With all its immense gains the Reformation brought one serious loss to Christianity—it split the Church into separate bodies divided along national and social lines. Protestant

Christianity has largely lost the consciousness of an international or supernational character, yet there has always lingered in the hearts of Christians the consciousness that the Church ought to transcend the bounds of nationality.

It is not strange that the Christian churches of the world are coming to recognize more clearly and seriously their responsibility for world evangelization. It is not difficult to believe what Richard Baxter said long ago: "If all Christians were reduced to a holy concord it would do more to win the heathen world than all other means can do without it." The desperate need for world evangelization is an overwhelming argument in favor of church unity. Statistics show that we have classed as Evangelical Christians, 200,000,000; Roman Catholic, 272,860,000; Eastern or Greek Church, 120,000,000. A total of 592,860,000. Jews, 13,052,846; and the challenge comes to Christianize 221,825,000 Mohammedans and 847,951,000 other non-Christians. With one third of the world which has received in part the message of Christ it would seem plain that united effort alone and the elimination of useless denominational divisions can extend the kingdom of Christ.

There is a disproportion in the amount spent on church maintenance in the United States and Canada annually, representing \$340,000,000 as compared with the amount of \$33,785,687 spent for Home and Foreign Missions. This disproportion and the failure to make an impact upon the money of Christians and their sense of stewardship is still more glaringly disclosed when we think of the astounding figures spent for liquor, tobacco, automobiles, moving pictures, soft drinks, candy and chewing gum, the last item alone being \$34,000,000 or more than the American churches give for home and foreign missions in a year.

When we enter the foreign field itself we discover obstacles caused by the conditions at home. To assert that the object of missions is to extend the denomination is to arouse the question—Which denomination? Which one or ones of the

164 in the United States alone and the scores of others in Europe? If *one* is agreed upon, which subdivision of it? Picture the religious chaos on the foreign field if these home divisions are to be emphasized; and if it is not a necessary part of our foreign mission policy to perpetuate in Asia and Africa the sectarian divisions of Europe and America why continue them in the home land? Why should the Christians of Korea be divided into Northern Presbyterian and Southern Presbyterian because a Civil War was waged in the United States a half a century ago? Why should the Christians of India be labeled English Wesleyans, German Lutheran and American Baptist? Why establish a Dutch Reformed Chinese Church? If the statesman-like policy followed in building up Union universities in the cities of China and in strategic centers in Asiatic countries is wise, and results in enormous increase in efficiency, within the limits that mission boards can provide, why should not the church at home learn the lesson? China alone has put thirty insitutions under interdenominational control.

It is doubtless true that the small, denominational college has played a most honorable part in the intellectual and religious development of the United States but the question arises, is it not time to meet the changed conditions confronting us? The small, local college was needed years ago. Is it needed today? Forty colleges in Ohio, thirty-three in Illinois and twenty-six in Iowa suggest that the waste and inefficiency of duplication are almost as serious in education as in churches. The Christian college which will train men for Christian service is more urgently needed than ever but modern conditions call for an improvement of plants, faculties and curriculum, not only by more liberal support but by consolidating institutions.

In a recent article in *The Missionary Review of the World* the situation and possibilities are succinctly presented:

"YOU MAKE CHRISTIANITY ATTRACTIVE."

Forgetting self in the service of men the Y. M. C. A. has gained a world-wide fame. The Red Triangle is known and welcomed everywhere and its initials have come to mean *You Make Christianity Attractive*. The political and military leaders give it unqualified endorsement. All classes of men are attracted. Money has poured into the treasury. Men press forward with applications for service. Hundreds of thousands of men have been saved from vice and ruin, have been enlisted in educational classes, and thousands have been quietly but effectively led to Christ.

"What then? What would happen if the whole Christian Church would take such a comprehensive view of its task? Surely no greater cause could be presented than that of saving men for time and eternity. What might not be done if the forces of Christendom should unite to study the needs of the world; should readjust their organizations, their home expenses, their workers in the field, their plans of campaign—not with a narrow view but from the standpoint of the whole? What would happen if China and Africa and India and South America were studied and occupied in this same way? Would not this Christian statesmanship appeal to multitudes so that there would be an unprecedented response in workers and money? Overlapping and rivalry would cease. Money and men would be saved and Christianity would make an impression on the world such as has never been possible with a divided church. Past excuses for failure would be forgotten. The united prayer that would follow would mean new power—for no amount of men, money or organization would avail for bringing new life to men without the direction and power of the Spirit of God."

Coming back to the question of Church organization, we all recognize that Christian unity—not Church unity—made great progress in the nineteenth century, due to the growth of sentiment in favor of foreign missions and the tendency toward interdenominational activities and the adoption of the

method of council instead of antagonism by the churches and it is gratifying to note that more progress has been made in the first decade of the present century than in the first five decades of the nineteenth or perhaps in the four centuries which preceded the nineteenth put together.

It doubtless is true that the union sentiment is still a good deal muddled and by no means clear cut in the minds of many Protestants, but it exists very definitely and positively none the less. The fruitage is not distant but what shape church unity will take, it is perhaps impossible to say. For the Protestant churches of the United States, the immediate duty is to aid and coöperate in every way possible with the Federal Council of the churches of Christ in America. It is the most helpful movement for serious Christian coöperation which has yet been devised, for it unites the denominations through representatives with authority from the supreme judicatories of thirty denominations. It likewise secures the coöperation of particular churches in a given community or state by means of state federations, county federations, town and city federations.

The Federal Council has accomplished more in the past ten years in creating an atmosphere and in securing practical coöperation than has been accomplished perhaps in one hundred years past. For nearly four hundred years the movement has been on foot of multiplication of denominations in isolation, worse still in competition and almost never in coöperation, but the past decade is the inspiring story of real church coöperation.

As Dr. Macfarland says of the present situation:

The world is in a struggle for democracy, and democracy is simply another name for spiritual unity. We knew that man has a soul; we are learning that nations have souls. We are beginning to discover that the world has a soul. The prophesy of Jesus is being fulfilled in our search for spiritual unity.

There is little hope for the future in leagues of nations and

world courts for political uniformity, unless some institutions in human form finds and expresses this unity of spirit and ideal. With all their human limitations, the churches still symbolize those ideals and stand for that spiritual democracy which must underlie the new political democracy. The issue is determined by two processes: first, within each nation the unification of its own spiritual forces, and, second, the rapidly developing fraternity of the churches of one nation with another.

You ask, "What do you mean, one church?" Yes, we mean one church. But how far its unity will be that of identity and how far that of diversity, we have not the wisdom to answer. The Federal Council of the Churches at Washington at the opening of the war did not know it, perhaps, but it really formulated the new common creed in these historic words:

As members of the church of Christ, the hour lays upon us special duties:

- To purge our own hearts clean of arrogance and selfishness;
- To steady and inspire the nation;

- To keep ever before the eyes of ourselves and of our allies the ends for which we fight;

- To hold our own nation true to its professed aims of justice, liberty, and brotherhood;

- To testify to our fellow Christians in every land, most of all to those from whom for the time we are estranged, our consciousness of unbroken unity in Christ;

- To unite in the fellowship of service multitudes who love their enemies and are ready to join with them in rebuilding the waste places as soon as peace shall come;

- To be diligent in works of relief and mercy, not forgetting those ministries of the spirit to which, as Christians, we are especially committed;

- To keep alive the spirit of prayer, that in these times of strain and sorrow men may be sustained by the consciousness of the presence and power of God;



To hearten those who go to the front, and to comfort their loved ones at home;

To care for the welfare of our young men in the army and navy, that they may be fortified in character and made strong to resist temptation;

To be vigilant against every attempt to arouse the spirit of vengeance and unjust suspicion;

To protect the rights of conscience against every attempt to invade them;

To maintain our Christian institutions and activities unimpaired, that the soul of our nation may be nourished and renewed through the worship and service of Almighty God;

To guard the gains of education, and of social progress and economic freedom, won at so great a cost, and to make full use of the occasion to set them still further forward, even by and through the war;

To keep the open mind and the forward look, that the lessons learned in war may not be forgotten when comes that just and sacred peace for which we pray;

Above all, to call men everywhere to new obedience to the will of our Father God, who in Christ has given Himself in supreme self-sacrifice for the redemption of the world, and who invites us to share with Him His ministry of reconciliation.

To such service we would summon our fellow Christians of every name. In this spirit we would dedicate ourselves and all that we have to the nation's cause. With this hope we would join hands with all men of good-will of every land and race, to rebuild on this war-ridden and desolated earth the commonwealth of mankind, and to make of the kingdoms of the world the kingdom of the Christ.

But this was a war-time creed. It was a temporary thing. Was it?

The brewers of America have an advertisement in which they warn the people that if prohibition comes in war-time it will stay forever. They are undoubtedly right. May it not be that the Christian churches will say: If we can live and

serve and suffer this way in time of war, shall we not do so in time of peace?

Another challenge in this Federal Council sent out from the annual meeting held in Cincinnati, Ohio, December, 1917, is as follows:

"This is the time of heart-searching and revaluation of present forces and organizations, a realignment of churches in the interest of economy, efficiency, unity, the glory of God and the greater good of mankind.

"The Christian churches of America, with the nation, face world problems today. To meet these problems there must be thrift, coöperation, nation-wide and world-wide vision, and greater unity of life and action.

"Groups of denominations, constituting one family, by reason of history, polity and doctrine, might well seriously and promptly consider the present-day providential call to unite, and thus meet the shortage of ministers, overcome administrative duplication, overlapping of territory, and overlooking of the needs of great sections of our land and of nations abroad."

We believe that the first step toward Church Unity is through federation of denominations and the second step is close federated action or organic union between families of churches. The further progress of the Federal Council of Churches waits upon the lessening of the number of denominations; and the better federation of particular churches in a community likewise waits upon the union of families of churches. Unless denominations allied together historically, doctrinally and by reason of polity unite, it would seem as if there is a centrifugal movement setting in which will develop *community* churches and retard real church unity.

At the present time there are three outstanding types of Community Churches:

The *first* unites the several congregations in a denominational church.

The *second* is the original type of the union church without any denominational affiliation.

The *third* is the so-called federated congregation and is the one especially favored in many instances.

Perhaps in the present state of progress the federated congregation is desirable but it is at best a makeshift with dangerous possibilities. The churches agree to unite as one congregation, for all purposes of work, and worship, under one pastor. To carry out this purpose each appoints an equal number upon a joint committee of management. Sometimes members are added from the community. The pastor usually is chairman. Each church meets as an ecclesiastical body, by itself, to transact business according to its usages and reports to its denomination its work as a member of the federated church. Each church makes its own rules and members are added to the church of their choice. All are members of the federated church. The pastor must necessarily have ecclesiastical standing in some body. If there is more than one usable house of worship it may be used in turn or devoted to institutional purposes, or sold.

Under this plan of federated churches, Methodists are Methodists still, Presbyterians are Presbyterians as before. It simply provides for local coöperation and the lessening of expense in the maintenance of the local church.

The community church idea points the way to coöperation, not competition. Who cannot see the multiplied power and influence of the Christian minister if, as a result of union of denominations and of articular or local congregations in our own cities, there was a proper distribution of church buildings and plants with the assignment of work to ministers for which they are fitted. Some men can preach, some are strong executives, others devoted pastors but few ministers are equally strong in the pulpit, in the pastorate and in executive functions. If we had coöperative Protestantism, with the reduction of denominations to two or three great families of churches, it would be possible to have great preaching centers, with a distribution of smaller buildings covering a given parish, for the work of religious education and Christian

service. It would mean collegiate system of pastorates, with an ample corps of properly developed men, for the work of the Christian church, in a sane and well-directed fashion. Such a union of churches and reestablishment of parish lines would mean more economy in plans, in money, in service, in worship and thousands saved to support adequately home and foreign missions and the church in various communities, molding the thoughts of the community and leading in all great movements.

Such a nation of churches and reestablishment of parish lines would result in greater efficiency for the ministry, in larger service for the laity, more comprehensive plans for the community, nation and world and millions of dollars would be saved to support, adequately, home and foreign missions.

It would place the church of the various communities, state and nation in a position to mold the thoughts of the community and to lead in all great movements.

The most imperative need which can only be met by greater church unity, is in the matter of religious education. The three greatest problems confronting the Christian churches of the world today are: *Christian Education*, *Christian Social Righteousness* and *Christian Unity* and the first two await the third.

President Wilson, some months ago, sent a message to school officers, urging them to increase materially the time and attention devoted to instruction bearing directly on the problems of community national life. He made a plea, not for a temporary enlargement of the school program appropriate to the period of the war, but a plea for the realization in public education, of the new emphasis which the war has given to the ideals of democracy and to the proper conception of national life. We have seen how Germany has developed the militaristic spirit and Pan-Germanism through its schools, using both school teachers and ministers for this purpose; and we are coming to see in America that our system of education is at fault. Provision, for instance, must be made for weekday

religious education. The church is responsible for this religious education in a free state. The church is the teacher and guardian and the source of moral and religious education. The state is ready to give time to the church for a program of religious education but the churches of America are not ready because of their divisions.

Religious education and Christian life and activity are the two basic principles upon which the church of the future can be built and these two wait organized leadership and the co-operative form of church organization, democratic in spirit, both for the nation and the world. Let us heed on this point the word of Professor John Stuart Blakie who, as early as 1890, writing of the Christianity of the future, indicates the better way. He says: "That if the persons who lead the Christian world stamp on their minds firmly these two principles: (1) That all extremes are wrong, and again, that all religion, as Cicero says of virtue—(2) consists in action, we shall see the commencement of the millennium."

The return to the fundamentals of the Gospel, the Fatherhood of God, the Brotherhood of Man, the Redemption by our Lord and the law of Love, not as a mere council of perfection but as having binding force upon believers—these are the factors by means of which an intellectualized Christianity is to be born again. Then will we say with John Hay:

"Not in dumb resignation we lift our hands on high;  
Not like the nerveless fatalist content to do and die;  
Our faith springs like the eagle who soars to meet the sun  
And cries exulting unto thee, O Lord, thy will be done!  
\* \* \* \* \*

Thy Will! It bids the weak be strong; it bids the strong be just:  
No lip to frown; no hand to beg; no brow to meet the dust.  
Wherever man oppresses man beneath the liberal sun,  
O Lord, be there; thine arm to bare;  
Thy righteous will be done!"

On this basis let the churches unite. Let them differ in their formal beliefs, their ritualistic observance. Let freedom be given as to organization, but let there be coöperation

in united enthusiasm and endeavor to realize in this world the Kingdom of God and then "This day we fashion destiny," and we will be able to say:

"O Christ, most passionate lover of all,  
Help us to answer thy trumpet call.  
Rally all nations under the sun,  
Thy warring peoples pledge as one  
In a great world oath of Brotherhood,  
To toil for the Future's good.  
If we hate with a hate that is pure enough,  
And love with a love that is sure enough,  
Thy dream for man shall yet have birth,  
Thy Kingdom come on earth."

PHILADELPHIA, PA.



### III.

## THE AMERICAN COLLEGE IN WAR TIME AND THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF THE COUNTRY.

HENRY HARBAUGH APPLE.

In considering any sphere or activity of American life at the present time we must bear in mind and clearly recognize several outstanding facts.

The first of these is that this is our war. We were not involved in its beginning. Its immediate occasion was the assassination of the Archduke Francis Ferdinand and his wife of Austria while traveling in Serbia on June 28, 1914. On July 23, 1914, the Austro-Hungarian Government delivered an ultimatum, to which demands the Serbian Government yielded in practically every point except the one concerning her own sovereignty and offered to refer to the Hague Tribunal the one point not completely conceded. But Austria, without further discussion, declared it unsatisfactory and by 6 o'clock on July 25, severed relations with the smaller kingdom and war was then inevitable, and was formally declared on July 28, 1914. The murder of the heir to the throne furnished the Austro-Hungarian Government with an excuse to square its account with Serbia, which in the eyes of the German, Magyar, and military elements of the monarchy was long overdue. It was supposed then and has since been clearly proven that Germany was privy to Austria's plans and desired it as a pretext for a war which would involve other great powers of Europe and contribute to the enlargement of German dominion. This expectation was foreshadowed in the German army act of 1913 which reads as follows: "Our new army law is only an extension of the military education of

<sup>1</sup> A paper read before the Spiritual Conference at Lancaster, Pa., in July, 1918, by Henry Harbaugh Apple, D.D., LL.D., president of Franklin and Marshall College.

the German nation. Our ancestors of 1813 made greater sacrifices. It is our sacred duty to sharpen the sword that has been put into our hands and to hold it ready for defense as well as offense. We must allow the idea to sink into the minds of our people that our armaments are an answer to the armaments and policy of the French. We must accustom them to think that an offensive war on our part is a necessity, in order to combat the provocations of our adversaries. We must act with prudence so as not to arouse suspicion and to avoid the crises which might injure our economic existence. We must so manage matters that, under the heavy weight of powerful armaments, considerable sacrifices, and strained political relations, the precipitation of war would be considered as a relief, because after it would come decades of peace and prosperity, as after 1870." When the stage was set, in order not to arouse a similar suspicion, the Kaiser left the country and was in a foreign State, though near home, when the conflict started. Russia and France were the first nations attacked. England was drawn in when the Germans pronounced a sacred agreement only a "scrap of paper" and ruthlessly invaded Belgium and threatened the safety of her people. Later another great nation, Italy, joined forces with the allies and for three years there was a war such as the world had never before known.

At the outbreak of the war America was a spectator and without immediate and deep sympathies for either side in the struggle. Although jealously watched by spies we did not see that we had anything to do with an European war. Then we began to study deliberately the problem as to which nation was responsible for the war and we were compelled to conclude that the outbreak of hostilities was primarily chargeable to Germany. It was at least certain that the military authorities in Germany, directly and with amazing forethought, planned for a war which must come soon, and they were determined to win for the country a "place in the sun" and establish its power. A further study revealed the astonishing fact that one of the ultimate objects concerned our own

country, which was to be considered after France was crushed and England subdued. Cumulative irritation at German methods and policies, acts of Zeppelin raids, poisonous gas, the deportation of men and women from portions of France and Belgium, the sinking of the "Lusitania," a shameful and premeditated crime, the "Sussex" affair and ruthless submarine warfare directed against neutrals as well as belligerents and countless horrors of official acts, brought about strained relations. Evidence that the German Ambassador, Count von Bernstorff, was directing German espionage and criminal acts of violence caused his dismissal and Congress was finally asked to declare the existence of a state of war.

There is implied in what I have stated the second outstanding fact—we must win the war. Whatever may have been the occasion for its beginning and the conditions of its prosecution, there is now no doubt of the issue at stake. It is not primarily a question of form of government, of territory, of commerce and trade, of finance, of balance of power, however these problems are more or less involved in it. But it is in the highest sense a question of right against wrong, of decency against indecency, of honesty against dishonesty, of civilization against barbarism, of material aims against spiritual ideals. We must win the war in order to conserve the best and deepest elements of human life and the most vital forces of civilization. For this holiest cause that ever challenged the resources and patriotism of a nation we must be willing to sacrifice if needs be our last dollar and our last man and America cannot yield until a complete victory is won.

The third fact which is equally important is that in order to win the war we must be able to utilize the service of every man, woman and child, the force of every sphere of intellectual and moral power, as well as the material resources of every phase of industry. This is preëminently a scientific war and victory depends not alone on the fighting qualities of the Army and Navy but in a large measure upon all the resources of the nation. We are fighting a foe who has an organization

both military and economic that has been in process of construction for more than forty years. Our nation, organized on the basis of peace, must be able to adapt its resources for purposes of war. It is the main business of every person, every industry, every institution to find a place of coöperation in this national organization, involving such readjustment as will contribute to the aim and purpose of the nation at war.

I have given this too-lengthy introduction in order to emphasize the place occupied by the American colleges and their opportunity and privilege to serve the nation in this time of emergency. They constitute an essential force or sphere of life which must contribute to the nation's efficiency. And it is significant that this is the purpose for which these institutions were founded. All the charters of the earliest colleges in this country state the definite aim for their existence to be fundamentally to train young men for American citizenship. The very wording in them is similar. As an illustration I may be permitted to quote from the document of our own Franklin and Marshall College. In petitioning the Legislature of Pennsylvania for a charter the founders asked that the institution be established in order to preserve republican government, to promote improvement in the arts and sciences which alone render nations respectable, great and happy, and promote an accurate knowledge of the learned languages, of mathematics, morals and natural philosophy, divinity and all such other branches of literature as will tend to make good men and useful citizens. The specific aim of the college was further emphasized in the preamble of the act of incorporation. The grant was made because "the citizens of this state have eminently contributed by their industry, economy and public virtues to raise the state to its present happiness and prosperity,"—and because of "a desire to increase and perpetuate the blessings derived from the possession of property and a free government"—"to train up a succession of youth to fully understand, zealously practice, and strenuously defend the republican form of government." The

scope of the sphere of these early colleges was national in its conception. It was at a time that the infant republic was being tested in its right to live and its ability to grow. There was the necessity of improving the younger generation that there might be assured a strong American nation.

It was only natural therefore, and yet it is worthy of commendation and prominent announcement, that when the integrity of the nation was challenged the first strong protest came from within the colleges of the land. They were among the first to have an intelligent understanding of the importance and significance of the conflict and to recognize the danger which confronted us. It will be remembered that soon after the beginning of the war and before our nation was engaged in it, some 352 German university professors joined in a petition to the Imperial Chancellor under date of June 20, 1915. It was circulated first only as a "strictly confidential manuscript," afterwards made public. The purpose of it was to confirm and sanction the practices as well as the purpose of Germany in the war. It meant, mark you, the stamp of approval on such statements as these: "As one of the great powers we can and must have further growth: we must grow into a world power" (Professor Lasson, a professor of philosophy and higher education). "We are morally and intellectually superior to other nations; we are without equals. The same is true of our organization and our institutions" (Prof. Oswald Flamm). "If neutrals [vessels] were destroyed without leaving any trace, terror would soon keep seamen and travelers away from the danger zones and thus save many lives." This petition rested on the assumption that the power of the conqueror becomes the supreme moral law and showed a shocking reversion toward moral savagery. It emphasized a spirit which was again revealed in the statement of Pastor Baumgarten, "Any one who cannot bring himself to approve from the bottom of his heart the sinking of the 'Lusitania,' who cannot conquer his sense of the monstrous cruelty to countless perfectly innocent victims—and

give himself up to honest joy at this victorious exploit of German defensive power—such an one we deem no true German." It lauded the policy of efficiency for world dominion including the most diabolical practices of treachery, murder, rapine and all the beastly atrocities which have shocked the civilized world.

It was then that this first united effort to speak for America and Americanism came from the colleges and universities. It was in the form of a brief drawn up and signed by 105 American professors and sent to France as an expression of sympathy and encouragement with her cause. It defined what has now come to be clearly understood as the ideals of the Allies and pointed out the irreconcilable conflict between the will to might of the German government and the will to right, between which there can be no compromise and that the great moral object of the war must be achieved. This paper, of which the writer was one of the signers, immediately drew the fire of German propaganda, that it was a biased judgment and misrepresented the German mind and character. It was, however, a true interpretation of the aims and practices which have since been so vividly demonstrated to the world. Thus the educational institutions took their stand openly in defence of justice and righteousness even before the pulpit had the courage to proclaim it and before the mass of the American people were aware of the attempt to compel submission by the sword. These faithful watchmen upon college towers looked below the surface of things and saw there a mightily and all-embracing struggle between two conflicting principles of human right and human duty. They sought to arouse the nation to the fact that the condition under which we had proclaimed neutrality was the beginning of a conflict between the divine right of kings to govern mankind through armies and nobles, and the right of the peoples of the earth who toil and endure and aspire, to govern themselves by law under justice, and in the freedom of individual manhood. It was evident to them that the two systems could not endure



together in the same world. If autocracy triumphed, military power—lustful of dominion, supreme in strength, intolerant of human rights, holding itself above the reach of law, superior to morals, to faith, to compassion—would crush out the free democracies of the world. If autocracy were defeated and nations were compelled to recognize the rule of law and of morals, then and then only would democracy be safe. They pronounced the firm conviction that there is no room left in the world for barbarians, for heathen tribes without the law. Humanity is not safe while any nation professes inhumanity. This was the great fact with which these custodians of intellectual and moral culture challenged the loyalty of every humane man. In that day, characterized by indecision and uncertain thinking, the colleges became conspicuous centers of genuine Americanism and loyal patriotism. They formed a nucleus around which was being formed the growing sympathy with the cause of the allies and the zealous devotion to liberty and freedom.

This is sufficient to explain why the German propaganda was directed and exercised with systematic persistence in the colleges. Those who were exposing it and diligently striving to counteract it were frequently called alarmists and classed as chauvinists but later investigations showed it to be no nightmare but a real and dangerous menace. The despicable spy system was then working boldly to the Kaiser's taste. With all the arrogance and effrontery of German character American ideals were openly slurred and American efficiency derided by those who were either in the actual pay of the German government or were obsessed with the desire to promote the interests of the fatherland. They sought to spread treason in the guise of academic teaching, indifferent of the fact that when any member of a college faculty throws about himself the cloak of academic freedom to utter treason, then academic freedom is a farce. The extent to which this was promulgated was revealed only in the light of later investigation, some of which is now being made known. A professor in one of the

New England colleges after he was convicted of inciting treason, when asked why he remained in a small college when he might have worked in a larger sphere answered that he had been instructed to stay there because he could do more damage in a college than in any other place in the country. Here was a rich field for his insidious and nefarious practice because he could act upon the minds of youth at the most susceptible age. While the public generally had their attention centered largely on the work of spies who would blow up munition plants or destroy industrial establishments college authorities were confronted with the problem of meeting the intellectual destruction in perverting the convictions of young manhood. Within the last few days the government published the statement that the German slush fund of \$90,000,000 under direction of Bernstorff and Münsterberg, who is now known to have been in the pay of the German government, was not only intended to control newspapers and magazines but to foster a pacifist sentiment in colleges. But these institutions remained true to their mission to train in American citizenship. Some professors were convicted and expelled, many others, scenting danger, voluntarily resigned under the palpable subterfuge of ill health or the desire to enter upon some more agreeable work. The American colleges, and this is an important fact, are today more free of spies and German propaganda than any other sphere of national activity.

It ought to be mentioned too that this propaganda was not only through personal influence but carried on to a considerable extent by text books "made-in-Germany." The increasing elimination of the study of German in the public schools is not primarily a repudiation of the cultural value of the language or its usefulness in life. It is rather the natural reversion against all things German in which we have lost confidence and an object lesson in patriotism for the youth of the land. It means in the words of Harvey M. Watts, "that henceforth things German cannot be determined apart from the revelations of the present war; that the value of

Germanic study as evidenced by the methods and ideals of twenty years ago is neutralized by the present intellectual and moral state of the German mind; that there is no indication of a return to the older, saner ways which all of us have admired and trusted; that the new Germany is brutalized, mind, soul and body; that the preservation of our youth is infinitely more important than the gain or loss of German educational influence; that the linguistic and literary value of Germanics for this country must be weighed in the scales of humanity and morality; that German methods have no meaning here except in so far as they minister to the unfolding of democracy and liberty."

This intellectual service of the colleges, which is an important contribution to the mind of the nation, though not as readily measured as material resources, has been supplemented by the activities of college professors on the public platform and in the press. By mouth and pen they have been earnest and useful in stimulating patriotism throughout the land. When America entered the war it was found to be wise if not absolutely necessary to educate the people of the nation in the real issues of the war and to cultivate adherence to Americanism and American ideals. As to those fitted for the task the government naturally turned to the teachers in colleges and universities. These responded and became the leaders of a large number of public speakers who are now endeavoring to inspire intelligent patriotism and instruct people of the dangers which confront us. A few months after we declared war a meeting was held at Rochester and a systematic arrangement was made to enlist these men in the service to speak and write. By this educational coöperation pamphlets upon the war were prepared for world wide circulation setting forth America's side of the war, explaining this country's objects and methods in prosecuting the war and exposing the enemy's misrepresentations, aggressions and malpractices. A large number of college professors are giving voluntary service to this end. The government committee

on public information has had the assistance of forty or fifty, all giving their services as unpaid volunteers. They are also stimulating the study of the war by lectures and text books. Six great associations of universities and colleges, in charge of Dean Olin Templin of the University of Kansas, are mobilizing the great institutions of learning, placing in them courses of study to fit students for service. In more recent days departments have been organized and equipped to give special and technical training calculated to fit boys for specific usefulness. Some idea of this particular work can be seen in our own old academy building where the Aviation Mechanics' School is now being conducted. The colleges also have given speakers, workers and executives who are rendering splendid assistance in the various familiar drives for Liberty Bonds, War Saving Stamps, and in directing and stimulating the Red Cross, Young Men's Christian Association and other organizations and causes contributory to winning the war.

It must not be overlooked that an important contribution which the colleges have made to the nation is in the services and eminent efficiency of their alumni. There never has been a time when college men have so universally been placed in important positions in the government. Most of the great leaders in the war are college men. President Wilson is a college graduate; so is every member of his cabinet. The head of the Red Cross was a college professor and the Chairman of the National War Work Council of the Y. M. C. A. a college trained man. The food administrator, the fuel administrator, the head of the country's railroad administration, the head of the ship building commission, and most of the big men turned to in the emergency are college men. Brave old General Pershing's first position was as principal of a colored school in his home town in Missouri. The Chief of Engineers, Gen. Wm. Murray Black, and the Chief of the Army Staff, Gen. March, received college training. The submarine device, the gas bomb, the food substitute, the much needed chemical dye, in short, the essential resources are the products

of college brains. The new National Army is commanded largely by college men, who are giving their brains and skill in the leadership of men less skilled. The first requirement for aviation recruits is two years in college or its equivalent. It is not too much to say that the path of leadership has been through the college. These are the men on whom rests the burden to win the war.

The part taken in the war by the undergraduates of colleges is even more conspicuous. Some day in the future when the history of this age is recorded reference will be made to the amazing feat of this country in the ability to raise and train an efficient army in a remarkably short period of time. And one of the most important reasons assigned to it will be the fact that at the first call for volunteers there came out of the colleges at least 45,000 young men to undergo instruction in officers' training camps and then to drill the raw material which formed the new national army by enlistment and draft. In the formation of an army the first consideration was the need of officers. In this emergency the nation again turned to the universities and colleges and secured young men with superior qualifications for officers. After Congress declared a state of war and President Wilson called for men in defense of the nation, from no sphere of life was there such a quick and loyal response as from the institutions of learning. Leaving their academic halls they entered upon rigid discipline in sixteen cantonments. Eighty-five per cent. of those given this first training were college students. After receiving commissions they were transferred as officers to the numerous training camps throughout the country. Most of them are now rendering a good account of themselves on the battle line in France, living up to their college ideals and the best traditions of American citizenship. This vanguard was followed by others in largely increasing numbers, now estimated at 150,000, in all lines of service in the nation. An organized effort was made to urge graduates of high schools and academies to enter college and the freshman classes were

about normal but at the opening of the institutions in the fall it was found that the enrollment was decreased on an average of twenty-five per cent., and it is estimated that about one fifth of those left at intervals during the academic year.

This eminent fitness of college men to become officers is worthy of comment. That they made superior officers indicated the value of college training. There has been a frequent criticism of the college course that it did not fit a student for anything in particular. In certain directions there was a conviction that it tended to unfitness for efficiency. The fact of the matter is that by reason of its general, all rounded discipline and development it fitted for anything or for everything. It laid a good strong and broad foundation. It produced a personality rather than a machine. The product was a man capable of using to the fullest extent all his powers and endowments rather than one particular part of his talents. This is why those trained for the pursuits of peace could so readily meet the requirements of war. And it is of particular significance that those who had taken the purely classical courses were eminent in advancement. This is a matter of record. Canadian officers who came to the United States to assist in the formation of the first officers training camps reported publicly that it was their experience that the classical students formed the best material. And it was demonstrated in our own camp at Fortress Monroe. The training there was for the artillery branch of the service. The larger number of men sent to the camp were students who had been studying branches leading to engineering with a smaller number from the ordinary classical colleges. After the usual weeding out process had taken place it was found that not one of the classical students had been dropped. Other illustrations led to the same conclusion. In all probability the testing of all phases of education in our war experience will emphasize the importance and value of a general college education as over against distinctive technical training which does not include the cultural courses. As not before in generations, the prac-



tical value of college training to the nation was made apparent to all when the United States found itself involved in war. "College men preferred" was the whole story when the government set out to find the large number of trained leaders of which it suddenly found itself in sore need. So the call for college graduates was loud and we discovered almost in a day that the men who had been doing most for their country were the men who had established and maintained the colleges and provided the funds which made it possible for so many young men to receive a college education. In their gifts to colleges they had shown themselves to be patriots of the highest order, providing in advance for the nation's greatest need in time of crisis.

It would not be fair to imply that all the benefit and fitness were due to the studies of the class room. College education means more than that. It embraces all the intercourse of students with professors and with each other. The first of these provided an atmosphere which was favorable to lofty, thought, high ideals and holy aspiration—the mind to aspire and achieve. The second afforded opportunity for action and stimulated the will to execute. Student activities formed the practice ground upon which students could try out and test ability. For this purpose athletics had been especially valuable. The preference given to athletes was not based merely on the assumption that such boys possessed physical strength and hardened constitutions but it was a recognition of the truth that above their fellows they had already developed powers of initiative in personality, ability to organize the mind to a given purpose, persistence in overcoming difficulties, the refusal to be cast down by defeat, keen perception to seek out avenues for aggressive action and the use of every resource to win victory. In the brilliant advance which our American troops are making at the time of this writing are evidences of the initiative and strategy and courage learned by many boys on the football fields of American colleges. Whether the college of the future will have military drill and instruction as

a means of physical education it will not in my judgment supersede competitive games without eliminating a very essential feature of college discipline.

It must not be inferred that the contribution to the nation has been restricted to men. Colleges for women and coeducational institutions have responded with an equal readiness and supplied girls competent for efficient service. Trained women are now doing the executive work of this nation to a surprising extent. The first great call answered by them was in the profession of nursing. To care for the men when sick or wounded required from women the same sacrifices their brothers were making. In that way and by canteen service they ministered splendidly to the morale of our troops. In other fields they served as chemists, bacteriologists, psychologists, social workers, secretaries, executive positions in hospitals, in community work, in the protection of public health and they are scattered all through the great producing businesses that supply the sinews of war. They took the places of men in the foundries and factories and even in the field. One sphere after another called for trained women, women for leadership, women for executive work—college women.

That the supply is not equal to the demand is due to the fact that the necessity for such training was recognized by so few in the past. Multitudes of commercial schools, so-called business colleges had sent out girls and placed them in offices with machine-like skill. But they could not rise because they had little if any mental training, lacking trained ability. And the country is clamoring today for women who are really trained. In recognition of this necessity the attendance of women in colleges was increased at the opening of these institutions last fall. The number undergoing such training will undoubtedly rise in the future. Woman today stands on the threshold of a larger kingdom. New fields are opening. She must be fitted for leadership in the tremendous work of reconstruction which will be required when the war is over. The girl high school graduate who decides now to go to col-

lege is not only doing a wise and shrewd thing but responding to a great patriotic duty.

While the war has thus enlarged the sphere of usefulness of the colleges and enabled them to demonstrate in a conspicuous manner the efficiency of their work; and shown them to be essential and vital forces to the life of the nation as never before realized, it has also brought suffering upon them. What they have been doing has entailed untold sacrifice. This has been willingly made as a generous patriotic service. But while the government has come to the aid of almost every industry of the land there has as yet been found no way of providing relief and aid for the colleges. Largely depleted of students and with greater demands made upon them they have been left mainly to themselves to work out their own problems, not the least of which is that of their finances. Take away from any industrial establishment at least one fourth of its production and put upon it a similar increase in expense and you have placed it perilously near bankruptcy. Economic conditions, however, tend to furnish industry with better prices while better prices in the way of supplies only further impoverish colleges.

The colleges suffered greatly during the Civil War, the only possible analogy to the present conditions. There have been many changes in the college movement since that time and only 262 of our present colleges and universities were in existence before 1861 so the parallel is by no means complete. During the Civil War, which was fought largely by boys of college age and in which the preliminary training was comparatively simple, the tendency was to close up colleges or continue with a mere skeleton organization and scarcely any students. Today the much larger proportion of the curriculum bearing some direct relation to war training, together with the selective draft, have greatly reduced the necessity for closing institutions. Coeducation is also an important factor in keeping up attendance. In some cases the college campus was the scene of actual fighting between 1861 and 1864, and

in the case of Emory and Henry College the plant was seriously damaged. Some of those which are now classed as first-class institutions were compelled to close during that period and we have some striking examples of effective combinations which were made with good permanent results. Randolph-Macon College, Emory and Henry College and Washington and Lee College were all shut down for the period of the war, and many other schools were practically empty. Randolph-Macon College lost all of its endowment and was compelled to change its location; Emory and Henry College was used as a military hospital. Leander Clark College was forced to change its location to a more favorable site. Among those which combined successfully, as a result of war conditions, we may note the union of Washington and Jefferson Colleges. While it is undoubtedly true that some institutions were forced out of existence from the pressure of the Civil War and the panics of the seventies which followed, it is not to be supposed that the alterations in the government list, which show a loss of almost one hundred institutions of college grade as between the maximum number and the number now in existence, are an actual mortality of colleges. The change in the number reported is partly due to a movement towards standardization by which a considerable group of schools, which should never have been rated as colleges, were reduced to a proper classification. Other unions of interest in the college field both preceding and following war times were due to other causes such as those which united Franklin and Marshall Colleges in 1853.

On the whole it would seem that the college situation today is infinitely less serious than it was during Civil War times. Endowments are larger, students more numerous, institutions are more generally distributed and supported by alumni, facilities are at hand for a massing of forces for effective work and the lines along which colleges may proceed, with a reasonable expectation of future progress, are quite clearly defined. Even in the face of war conditions, during the year 1917,

\$39,597,000 were contributed to the cause of education, the largest amount which has ever been dedicated to that cause in a single year. While the changes in personnel and type of work represent a natural adjustment to new conditions, the college world is conscious of a solidarity and fulness of power in its progress which has never before been realized.

Nevertheless the financial problem is a serious one, for colleges are business corporations as well as scholastic agencies. Dr. Thwing says, "Whatever truth lies in Napoleon's remark that 'armies go on their bellies,' that condition also applies to colleges. For they go on the income side of their annual budgets." Colleges and universities in the United States possess several sources of income. These are fees paid by the students, income from endowment, special grants or gifts, of which state universities are the beneficiaries from legislatures, moneys contributed by churches and from alumni and friends. The two first named sources, fees and income from endowment, are the principal support of the typical American college and university. These two sources at the opening of the war were about equal in amount. In the year 1896, 49 per cent. of income of colleges was derived from the fees paid by students and 51 per cent. from the revenue of the endowment; in 1896 the proportion paid by the students had risen to 60 per cent. and that provided by capital had fallen to 40 per cent.; in the year 1916, 54 per cent. was paid by students and 46 per cent. drawn from the income of endowment.

The financial crisis arises from one fact which cannot be stated with too great emphasis. It is the fact of the uncertainty of revenue arising from the doubt attending the number of students who will be enrolled in these more than 500 colleges and universities. The revenue is uncertain because the students, who will furnish about one half of the revenue, still form a very doubtful quantity. The twenty-five per cent. fewer students in the colleges this last year caused most of the institutions to close the year with a deficit. Can anything

better be hoped for in the next year? Most boys enter college about the age of eighteen and a half. If the draft age is not lowered they will not be called to the colors. But many have already entered such service of the government as receives them below that age and many others have been attracted by the increase of pay for other work. A boy of eighteen ineligible for service, may yet take the place of a brother of twenty-four who has gone to France. And in times of war with the general dislocation of thought and values, scholarship can make but a feeble call.

Colleges have been striving to meet the crisis in various ways. In probably all of them there has been a stoppage of the erection of new buildings or the adding to the equipment. In others there has been a lessening of expense in the release of some members of the teaching force, many of whom are now in the service of the nation, and the suspension for the time being of some departments of the institution. All these are negative and analogous to the method pursued in any business in cutting down cost. In view of the increased cost of living and the already small compensation of the teaching profession it cannot include reduction in salaries. And because of the smaller number of students in attendance any increase in fees will be of small assistance. There is but one other possible source to increase incomes,—through gifts made to tide them over the danger point. It evidently is not advisable, even though it were possible, to conduct a campaign for the increase of endowment. That must and will be done at the close of the war. For the present it is the main business of the college to help win the war and not hinder its prosecution. But gifts for immediate expenditures, to meet deficits, are essential if colleges are to be useful as forces contributory to winning the war. This necessity is increased a hundred fold if we consider denominational colleges which have a vital service to render to the church as well as to the nation. The mission of the college to the welfare of the church and for the integrity of democracy calls for high resolution and concerted



action in financial gifts to uphold intellectual standards in an industrial age, in a period of necessary and glorious military force, to help transmute things material into personal devotion to truth and to righteousness, in a time of public doubt, anxiety and fear. To meet and bear these responsibilities means the enlargement of thought and the enrichment of the character of the nation.

While government authorities have not had part in this financial problem of the colleges, they have given encouragement to filling the ranks of students in institutions of higher learning. At the beginning of the war President Wilson wrote, "I would particularly urge upon the young people who are leaving our high schools that as many of them as can do so, avail themselves this year of the opportunities offered by the colleges and technical schools to the end that the country may not lack an adequate supply of trained men and women." Dr. P. P. Claxton, United States Commissioner of Education, made an urgent appeal to the students in high schools and academies as a patriotic duty to continue their work. He said: "If the war should be long the country will need all the trained men and women it can get—many more than it now has. When the war is over there will be made upon us such demands for men and women of knowledge and training as have never before come to any country. There will be equal need for a much higher average of general intelligence for citizenship than has been necessary until now. The world will have to be rebuilt, and American college men and women must assume a large part of the task. In all international affairs we must play a more important task than we have in the past." Federal and state educational departments, various educational associations and agencies, as well as college executives are sounding a clarion call for more students, so as to overcome the social and scholastic ravages of the war and provide for the training of those who must manage the affairs of the nation in the future.

For the benefit of those students who are in college, going

forward with their academic work, to fit them for greater future usefulness and that they might have the most favorable development until their call comes, the government has now arranged for military drill and instruction under official direction. Beginning this September an officer will be detailed to each institution and students will be enlisted in a reserve force but will not be called out until they reach the age of twenty-one unless in case of extreme necessity.<sup>2</sup> A proportion from each college, one in each ten, has been sent to a students training corps (those from this section of the country going to Plattsburg) to receive instruction so as to help in the drill when they return to college in the fall. Every college will thus serve the purpose of a military camp in addition to its scholastic training.

The latter part of the subject of this paper, I take it, does not imply that any attempt should be made to predict or discuss the future development of our country, much less to consider any possible changes in the forms of academic training. He would be a rash man who would assume the rôle of prophecy. The foundations of the world have been shaken and the problems of the future are those of difficult rehabilitation. Those of us who are sanguine of just terms of peace see a future in which the United States will be called upon to take a leadership in world affairs and sterner problems than ever will arise for solution. Men and women of education and character will be needed more than ever before to lift civilization out of the depths into which war has plunged it. Through the schools we are putting into the national life those ideals and purposes which will certainly shape the course and destiny of the nation and determine its contribution to world development and welfare.

Education at this time must not concern itself merely with the prosecution of the war. As far as colleges are concerned, the saying, "in time of peace prepare for war" must be amplified now and must read "in time of war prepare for peace." The important thing is to win the war but we can understand

<sup>2</sup> The Students' Army Training Corps has changed this plan.

a form of preparedness which will have to do with the problems that will arise after the war. And in this kind of preparedness the colleges can greatly help. It is to be hoped and to be expected that the war will be over before many of the school boys of today are old enough to bear arms for their country. We cannot afford to neglect the idea that these students may some day be soldiers, but we must bear in mind also that some day these boys will be citizens, and in the midst of the excitement and confusion of today the work of the colleges dare not lapse or slacken in the smallest degree.

While this country will gain in importance in finance and commerce and international relations, the greatest test will likely come in the ability to solve the problems of our own internal affairs. The question of government control of public utilities, the increased concessions made to labor and the restrictions placed on capital, the adjustment of industries and regulation of trade, the various humanitarian interests, the growing and confusing socialistic tendencies, in short the whole government administration which is now organized for specific and special purposes, will have to be reorganized and adapted to the best form of democracy. The work that lies before the young men and women today is difficult and they will find themselves unequal to it unless they have well trained minds for those grave future duties which in times of peace will come to them in double measure in meeting the social, technical and intellectual needs of a new world.

"The day has come when America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth and happiness and the peace that she has treasured." With those noble words President Wilson closed his great war message to Congress and in response to his call the colleges promptly furnished thousands of young men well prepared to be the nation's leaders in its hour of crisis. The immediate objective was to resist the encroachment of might upon the ideals of Liberty—to make the world safe for democracy. But it will not be a democracy safe for the world unless we

first put into the people the spirit and purpose of fraternity and service and teach them how to build a truly Christian democracy. For the accomplishment of this purpose the most potent agency is the Christian school and college and, therefore, he who labors to maintain these institutions manifests the highest type of patriotism and ministers most effectively to the deepest needs of the whole seething mass of humanity as it struggles toward the light.

LANCASTER, PA.

#### IV.

### THE MORAL AND RELIGIOUS ELEMENT IN MODERN FICTION.<sup>1</sup>

EDWARD A. G. HERMANN.

#### I.

The phrase "modern fiction" opens for us a gateway into a world that is big, interesting and inspiring. It has been for me a delightful privilege to ramble in this world, in order to observe the interplay of life and religion, and to bring to you, if not an exhaustive report, at least some of the impressions received upon this literary pilgrimage.

As I now emerge to tell you about some of the things I have seen, and heard, and felt, it is with a sense of the joy of discovery which one feels after coming into contact with some new phase of life, whether it be from revisiting some old, half-forgotten scene or striking out into new paths of adventure. And yet, as I come before you, it is not without a feeling of insufficiency for the task assigned me. Indeed, to do full justice to the theme, this pilgrimage should have begun twenty years ago, with eyes keen to see the hidden motives and purposes, the base passions and lofty ideals that have dominated the lives of men from time immemorial. A discussion of such a subject (if it is to be of the character which you have a right to expect) ought to be the flower and fruit of long years of patient reading and of deep, thorough study of the widest possible range of literature. As it is, the writer makes no claim to the dignified title of "man of

<sup>1</sup> Read before the members of the Spiritual Conference, Lancaster, Pa., July 24, 1918.

letters." He is only a busy pastor, subject to all the limitations of the flesh,—and of the ministry!—a lover of books, to be sure, but concerned chiefly not with literature but *life*. But it is for this very reason, perhaps, that one should feel deeply grateful. This pilgrimage in the great world of fiction has introduced me to characters I had never met in the miniature world in which I daily labor, and it has helped me better to understand and appreciate those whom I have known and loved long since. To move in such a world broadens one's viewpoint and enlarges one's sympathies. There is nothing in all God's universe so interesting as a human soul, and, in the truest sense, fiction deals with *souls*.

It is to be feared that we do not appreciate as we should the fact that this form of literature is one of the greatest interpreters of life. As the dew-drop mirrors the ever-changing clouds as they pass across the sky, so it is the function of the writer of fiction to hold up before us a mirror in which are reflected the endlessly varying movements of the human race. Thackeray exposes the shams and superficialities, the foibles and follies of the crowds in "*Vanity Fair*." Charles Dickens throws upon the screen of the imagination the moving pictures of the world's tragedy and humor as they are epitomized in the life of a great city. Scott wields his magic wand, touches our eyes, and we behold a world of romance and chivalry, love and war,—a world filled with brave knights and fair ladies. We go with George Eliot to the rural districts of the county of Warwick and as we move among the millwrights, craftsmen, farmers and peasants we see something of the reality of moral experience which issues in their growth or retrogression. By the witchery of Thomas Hardy's imagination we are lured to his Wessex country, where "farmers and milkmaids struggle in awful passion," the victims of temptation, folly and disaster. We feel the pathos of the struggle, its profound mystery, its utter hopelessness. Nathaniel Hawthorne takes us to the woods and haunted houses of New England, where in the long ago terrible crimes have been



committed but not forgotten, and lays bare the soul tortured by remorse. Whether or not men are conscious of it there is bound up with all this changing, complex life an unchanging moral law, and, with this law, an eternal spirit which we call religion. Whether or not men intend, or profess, to be moral or religious, the one fact that they must ultimately take into account is *God*. And, therefore, to discover what people are thinking about, to get a deeper insight into the workings of the universal heart and conscience, to comprehend the spiritual meaning back of all the restlessness of our times, the minister, above all other men, cannot afford to neglect the reading of modern fiction.

It is said that in the United States alone about ten thousand books leave the press annually. Of this number a very large proportion is made up of books of fiction. Of the books of fiction there are very few that do not in one way or another present problems that have a vital bearing upon the so-called higher life. When, therefore, we set out for the purpose of discovering those books that stand out strikingly because of their moral or religious teaching or influence, it is with the feeling with which one begins to explore an unknown forest. At first it is so easy to become lost in the vast wilderness and give up the quest. We cannot see the trees for the woods. It is not until, after much labor, we hew our way through the luxuriant undergrowth (much of which is either wild or poisonous and, therefore, useless and harmful) and get into the open, that we can see certain trees standing out in their strength and beauty, apart from, or above, the rest, with an individuality all their own.

Or, to change the figure, there are some books that tower above the great mass of literature as majestic mountain peaks tower above the plain and valley. Sometimes we get glimpses of them from the lowlands, but often they are hidden from our view by what is more immediate and less important, and it is only when we stand upon some intellectual or moral eminence that we can get the true perspective and appreciate their

sublimity, as when once we rode through the deep, shadowy ravines of the Rocky Mountains, unable for a long time to see what, amid those elemental forces of Nature, we had already begun to feel, and for hours slowly climbed the steep mountain sides until at last we stood on the very summit of Mt. McClellan, in that clear region above the clouds and mists where "meteors shoot, lightnings are loosened, stars come and go." It was from this higher altitude that we could get a vision that stretched out for hundreds of miles in every direction and from where it is said one can count one hundred and fifty-seven other peaks, all of them great, reaching out toward the Eternal and touching the very heavens. Such a mountain peak in the realm of literature is Victor Hugo's masterpiece, "*Les Misérables*." We must climb in order to reach the heights of his imagination, but once having attained we breathe an atmosphere that is intellectually and morally bracing. We need sometimes to lie down in the green pastures and beside the still waters of life, shepherding our thoughts carefully lest they go too far astray, but we do not realize the richest potentialities of our natures unless, like rugged heights-men, we climb among the hills. The reading of a book like "*Les Misérables*" gives us a vision which is impossible in the lowlands of literature. It towers above so many thousands of other books as the hero, Jean Valjean, towers majestically above millions of mediocre men. Here we meet with the elemental forces of the moral and spiritual world. Here is the raw material out of which true manhood is made. The great words written across those pages are conscience, law, truth, work, self-sacrifice, suffering, love, the immortality of the soul, God. A thousand influences play upon the soul of Jean Valjean, the victim of social injustice, the rebellious sufferer, until, through unselfish devotion to humanity and complete surrender to the will of God, he is transformed in character and finds the peace which passeth understanding.

In travelling through this world of fiction we meet with at least three different forms of literature,—the drama, the

romance and the novel,—unless we add, as a fourth, the short story which is closely related to the romance and the novel. But, lest we substitute license for liberty and wander into too many by-paths, it will be the part of wisdom to confine our discussion, for the most part, to the novel, though one is tempted to refer to certain dramatic productions which have a distinctively moral purpose or spiritual message, like Brieux's horribly realistic "Damaged Goods," or Maeterlinck's beautifully symbolical masterpiece "The Blue Bird." In eliminating the romance we may be permitted to make an exception to that searching analysis of the human soul, "The Scarlet Letter," by Nathaniel Hawthorne, which is on the border line between the novel and the pure romance and is usually classed with that notable group of psychological romances, "The House of Seven Gables," "The Marble Faun," and "The Blithedale Romance," all of which are fraught with profound spiritual meaning. The romance has been defined as "that prose fiction which deals with life in a false or fantastic manner, or represents it in a setting of strange, improbable, or even impossible adventures, or idealizes the virtues and vices of human nature." For our practical purpose we need not discuss the romance. The distinction between the romance and the novel has been finely brought out by one of our foremost writers of fiction. He says that a novel is "a story of human beings absolutely credible and conceivable, as distinguished from human beings frankly endowed with the glamour, the wonder, the brightness of a less exacting and more vividly eventful world. The novel is a story that demands, or professes to demand, no make believe. The novelist undertakes to present you people as real as any that you can meet in an omnibus." It has been pointed out that the four stages in the development of fiction from the romance to the novel were the "impossible," the "improbable," the "possible" and the "inevitable." What we want is the "inevitable." Our age demands the unveiling of the ultimate realities. Our literature must interpret life as it actually is.

In answer to the question "What is the novel?" F. Marion Crawford says "It is or ought to be a pocket-stage." "It may fairly be claimed," he says, in "*The Novel: What it is*," that humanity has within the past hundred years found a way for carrying a theatre in its pocket, and so long as humanity remains what it is, it will delight to take out its pocket-stage and watch the antics of the actors, who are so much like itself and yet so much more interesting." "All the world's a stage" said Shakespeare, and the novelist, with all the vividness and projecting power of his imagination, endeavors to crowd into his book a portion of the world. He breathes into the creatures of his imagination the breath of his own life and they become, for us, living souls. With all the intensity of his emotional nature he makes them laugh and cry, love and hate, sin and suffer, scoff and pray, think and toil and worship. The characters of the story must be real men and women, flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone, children of light and darkness, our human brothers and sisters, nay, our very selves.

The term "modern" as applied to fiction does not necessarily mean "recent." I take it that I am not called upon to rush to the nearest book-shop to procure the latest volume that has left the press, nor to review, or even mention, the best seller of the year. The word "modern" takes us back to at least as far as the middle of the nineteenth century which marked the beginning of the realistic period in literature. If for convenience you want to put up sign-posts to mark off the limits of this period we might put at the one end "Adam Bede" and at the other end, at least for the present,—well, what shall we say?—"The Soul of a Bishop"? The realistic period, so far as its emphasis upon the moral and religious is concerned, may be said to have begun with George Eliot. In her writings we feel the heart-throbs of humanity; we touch the full pulse of realism. The hand of this creative genius portrayed character as no one before had ever done and, indeed, as few have done since. In her work we see for the

first time an attempt at psychological analysis. George Eliot had not only a high conception of her artistic mission, but her intensely religious nature impelled her to take seriously the aim of interpreting life in its deepest aspects. But coming to this end of the realistic period, what shall we say of Mr. Wells?

## II.

At any rate, in an essay on "The Contemporary Novel," which appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly* a few years ago, Mr. Wells defined the scope of the realistic novel. "It is to be the social mediator, the vehicle of understanding, the instrument of self-examination, the parade of morals and exchange of manners, the factory of customs, the criticism of laws and institutions and dogmas and ideas. It is to be the home confessional, the initiator of knowledge, the seed of fruitful self-questioning. . . . I do not mean for a moment that the novelist is going to set up as a teacher, as a sort of priest with a pen, who will make men and women believe and do this and that. The novel is not a new sort of pulpit. Humanity is passing out of that phase when men sit under preachers and dogmatic influences. But the novelist is going to be the most potent of artists because he is going to present conduct, devise beautiful conduct, discuss conduct, analyze conduct, suggest conduct, illuminate it through and through. He will not teach but discuss, point out, plead and display. . . . We are going to write, subject to our own limitations, about the whole of human life. We are going to deal with political questions and religious questions and social questions. . . . What is the good of telling stories about people if one may not deal freely with the religious beliefs and organizations which have controlled or failed to control them? We are going to write about it all. . . . Before we have done, we shall have all life within the scope of the novel."

The realm in which the novelist works is, then, the realm in which art performs its high and unique service, for art, according to John Burroughs, in his "Literary Values," would

enable us to live in the whole and in the spirit of the whole; not in the part called morality, or philosophy, or religion, or beauty, but in the unity resulting from the fusion and transformation of these varied elements. It affords the one point of view whence the world appears harmonious and complete. The moralist, the preacher, seizes upon a certain part of the world, and makes much of that; the philosopher seizes upon another part; the æsthete upon another; only the great artist comprehends and includes all these, and sees life and nature as a vital, consistent whole."

Brander Matthews was thinking of the moral and religious element of fiction from the artistic standpoint when he said, "Morality,—a specific moral,—is what the artist cannot deliberately put into his work without destroying its veracity. But morality is also what he cannot leave out of it if he has striven only to handle his subject sincerely." Applying to the writer of fiction the words of Goethe to Eckermann concerning the poet as an artist, that "if there is a moral in the subject it will appear and the poet has nothing to consider but the effective and artistic treatment of his subject," and that "if he has as high a soul as Sophocles, his influence will always be moral," Dr. Matthews adds, "a high soul is not given to all writers of fiction, and yet there is an obligation on them all to aspire to the praise bestowed on Sophocles as one who 'saw life steadily and saw it whole.' Even the humblest story teller ought to feel himself bound not to preach, not to point a moral ostensibly, nor to warp the march of events for the sake of the so-called 'poetic justice,' but to report life as he knows it, making it neither better nor worse, to represent it honestly, to tell the truth about it and nothing but the truth."

The responsibility of the novelist is strongly set forth by Frank Norris, who claimed for the readers of fiction "a right to the Truth as they had a right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. It is not right," he says, "to be exploited and deceived with false views of life, false characters, false senti-



ments, false mortality, false history, false philosophy, false emotions, false notions of self-sacrifice, false views of religion, of duty, of conduct and manners."

In other words the writer of fiction as an interpreter of life must of necessity deal with all that is involved in the moral and religious aspects of life, but he must not cease to be an artist. "Thou shalt not preach" is the first and greatest commandment in the literary decalogue. To quote Burroughs again, "The condition of first importance with the artist is, not that he should have an ethical purpose, but that he should be ethically sound. He may work with ethical ideas, but not directly for them." Every artist ought to be an emancipated soul and yet he is everlastingly bound to obey the laws of his art. He dare not turn moralist, or preacher, or propagandist. When he transgresses and goes off into forbidden fields, he loses in artistic effect and, in the long run, in moral and religious influence. It is interesting to study the life and work of literary men and women and observe how this principle works itself out. The point which separates the artist from the preacher or propagandist is the fatal point in his career and marks the beginning of his literary decline. "Anna Karénina" represents the consummation of Tolstoy's artistic genius. "The Resurrection" is a book of great power, rich and fragrant with the spirit of Christ, throbbing with tenderness and pity for a fallen girl, but it is evident in this and later books that Tolstoy had turned propagandist and his "Resurrection" moves on a lower artistic plane than either "Anna Karénina" or "The Kreuzer Sonata," and it has been asserted by competent critics that it will lose its point when certain conditions which it describes disappear from Russian society. This principle holds in the case of many other great writers besides Tolstoy, and who can tell but that Mr. Wells, in his intense zeal to tell the world all about his discovery of "God, the Invisible King," will not relegate his enviable position as a novelist to other writers who will exert a sane and wholesome religious influence but at the same time remain conscious of their artistic mission?

## III.

In the treatment of our subject there are certain names that we have no right to ignore, while there are many which, for mere lack of space, we must necessarily exclude. We might omit further reference to Charles Dickens, but it would be as impossible for *me* not to mention him somewhere as it was for Mr. Dick in "Oliver Twist" to avoid getting in somewhere the name of that old English king, only in the case of the writer it is to be hoped that the persistent presence of the spirit of Dickens is due to sanity and admiration. Who does not love Charles Dickens, that Great Heart of the world of fiction who, like his Master, stretched forth his arms and said, "Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven"? His books are not what we call "religious" unless we identify religion with what is good and tender, and sweet and true in life. With an infinite patience for detail he depicted the characters of the lower middle classes of the great cities, and in the midst of all the smoke and grime, the sin and suffering and squalor he found something beautiful and pure to love. Unconsciously he preached with simplicity and power the gospel of human kindness. Each year for the past fifteen years it has been my custom at Christmas time to pause long enough in the rush to read "A Christmas Carol," which has been described as "the best example possible, the most direct, simple expression of that essential kindness, that practical Christianity which is at the bottom of Dickens' influence." We feel the spell of love upon our souls as we go out into the world with the memory of Tiny Tim's benediction, "God bless us, every one."

Since it has been intimated that this paper is to be made up largely of personal impressions, let me confess that to George Eliot more than to any other writer I owe my sense of the majesty and inexorableness of the moral law, which came to me in early youth when as a grocery clerk I read in spare moments the story of "Adam Bede." Memory brings up now

the picture of the old carpenter shop where the stalwart, honest young man was wont to work. I can see him standing there among the piles of chips and shavings, bending over his bench with his tools, and hear him singing in his rich baritone

“Awake, my soul, and with the sun,  
Thy daily stage of duty run,  
Shake off dull sloth,”

and then, after a brief silence during which he made some careful measurement, breaking out again with renewed religious fervor,

“Let all thy converse be sincere,  
Thy conscience as the noonday clear.”

I hear Dinah Morris praying fervently, and then preaching that touching sermon on the text, “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath annointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor.” “Dear friends,” she began, “Jesus Christ spoke those words. He said He came to preach the Gospel to the poor. I don’t know whether you ever thought about those words very much, but I will tell you when I first remember hearing them,” and she told of the influence upon her life of the preaching of Wesley. “I remember only one thing he told us in his sermon. He told us as Gospel means ‘good news.’ The Gospel, you know, is what the Bible tells us about God. Think of that now! Jesus Christ really did come down from heaven . . . and what He came for was to tell good news about God to the poor. Why you and me, dear friend, are poor. We have been brought up in poor cottages and have been reared on oat cake and lived coarse. . . . We are just the sort of people that want to hear good news. . . .”

But Hetty Sorrel,—*Ah, poor Hetty Sorrel!* She did not know the power of that Gospel. We feel a tenderness toward her and, with all her sternness even George Eliot’s heart must have yearned to help her, yet the inevitable processes of the

moral law were beyond her control, and she seems to have shown Hetty no mercy, no hope. She would not, she *could* not break the iron chain that linked together moral cause and effect. The poor, sinful soul, bruised and broken as it fell against the hard, cold moral law, cried out at last in utter despair. George Eliot's philosophy is well expressed in the words of one of her characters, "It was not worth doing wrong for,—nothing ever is in this world." As Bliss Perry so strikingly says, "Adam Bede" is preëminently a book of belief, written in the red blood of George Eliot's own spiritual life.

Everywhere in George Eliot's work we see characters growing or degenerating in accordance with a fixed law. For a study of deepest tragedy we go to "The Mill on the Floss." "Silas Marner" reveals the power of a new interest, a fresh impulse, a strong, tender devotion in the regeneration of character. It is the love of a little child that takes the place of greed for gold in the lonely life of the old miser. In "Romola" she probes deeply into the darkest recesses of Tito's soul and shows us in all their terribleness the slow, subtle processes of his degeneration. She applied to all life the most exacting moral and spiritual tests. So rigid were her standards, so high her ideals, that to many of her characters attainment seemed impossible, and as a result of their futile efforts they were haunted with a sense of having missed the supreme goal of life.

I mention Thomas Hardy by way of contrast, not because he was so intensely moral and religious but because he appeared, in certain respects, to be positively immoral and irreligious. It is not to be inferred that to cover up or to ignore vice and sin is necessarily to be moral,—we cannot attain goodness by shutting our eyes to evil! Nor is it true that to portray evil is to be immoral. Life includes both vice and virtue. The immorality may be said to consist in making more of the former than of the latter, thus destroying life's proportion; in overemphasizing, or dwelling upon, that phase

of life which is out of harmony with the highest, thus giving the impression of its being untrue. If, like most writers with a message, George Eliot erred at times in subordinating her art to moral conviction, Hardy went to the other extreme in utterly disregarding the moral and spiritual authority of dominant ideals in life and character. If the one sternly insisted upon obedience to law, the other cynically acquiesced to lawlessness. George Eliot was always reverent in spirit. She held the highest truth to be the truth of character. She had a sublime conception of moral law. She held life to be something sacred and divine. Hardy revered churches because they were the work of human hands. (He himself had been an architect.) But for Him in whose name and for whose worship the churches had been built he had absolutely no respect. He stood in awe of nature because nature seemed greater than himself. Nature looked down upon him with a sublime, cosmic indifference yet with the power to crush him at will. But God was to him a sort of weakling, morally inferior to human beings, an object of contempt, impotent to save or to destroy. Hardy was a thoroughgoing pagan, defiant in the presence of suffering, leaving his characters in the cruel hands of a blind fate. "*Tess of the D'Urbervilles*" was announced on the title page as "a pure woman faithfully presented," but as Hardy explained she was pure only in intention, and in closing the sad story of her deterioration he flipantly and ironically shifts the blame on God, referring to Him, in Aeschylean phrase, as the "President of the Immortals who had ended His sport with Tess." "*Jude, the Obscure*," "a tragedy of unfulfilled aim," has in it scenes that are foul and bestial and repulsive, and fill a clean mind with loathing and sullen rage. If one criticizes some of the more recent novels for their low ideals of marriage, false standards of conduct, and wrong or one-sided views of religion, he need only go back to the blatant paganism of "*Jude*" to see the difference. But in spite of the streak of vulgar realism which became so pronounced in Hardy's last work,

his stories abound in such beautiful nature descriptions and his style is so simple and delicate that in the minds of the devotees of his art he is saved from the charge of immorality.

#### IV.

Only a short time ago one of our ministers said that while our economic system is still largely pagan, our literature has become, for the most part, Christian. With all its acknowledged defects, this is clearly indicated by the quality, spirit, and tendency of much of our present-day fiction. One of our religious journals some time ago called attention to the universal revival of religious interest in literature and mentioned, in the following list, a few of the more important books of fiction in which that interest is expressed. "There is 'The Fool in Christ,' by Hauptman, the German, in which the idea of the reincarnation of Christ is the center of the story, and 'John,' by Suderman, which contrasts the method of John, the Baptist, with the conquering power of Him whose sword is called Peace and whose battle-cry is Mercy. In France there is Rostrand, characterizing the personality of Jesus and summarizing His teachings in 'The Samaritan,' and, in Russia, Andreyev in 'Judas Iscariot,' portraying the conflict between the two realms of action revealed in the contrasted personalities of Judas and Jesus, with a wonderfully beautiful revelation of the charm of Jesus; Selma Lagerlöf, of Sweden, with her 'Anti-Christ,' an attack on socialism for the purpose of showing its inadequacy as a solution of human problems and the final ascendancy of Christ and His kingdom; and Pontoppidon, of Denmark, with his story of 'The Promised Land,' in which the hero seeks the solution of his doubts and the ground of his hopes in every direction and finally learns that the longed-for Saviour of humanity is Jesus of Nazareth." No other character, declares this writer, "so dominates the dramatic world as Jesus," "no personality so holds the place in the center of the masterpieces of fiction," "no spirit is so often chosen for the inspiration of modern creative art as the spirit of Christianity."



Of course this moral and religious spirit manifests itself in a great variety of forms. It is interesting to note the many titles suggested by a biblical text or stories based upon a text, as, for example, "The Inside of the Cup," "A Certain Rich Man," "The Servant in the House," "The Way of all Flesh," "Whosoever shall Offend," "The Woman thou Gavest Me," and a host of others. In some stories the entire plot is worked out against a biblical or religious background while in others one or more characters are brought into contact with the saving power of religion. "The Yoke," by Elizabeth Miller, gives a vivid description of the Children of Israel in bondage in Egypt and of their exodus under the leadership of Moses. Marion Crawford's "Zoroaster" moves in the atmosphere of the court of Darius and reveals the religious influence of Daniel, the Prophet, upon the life of the reformer, Zoroaster. Palestine in the time of Christ forms the background of Lew Wallace's "Ben Hur"; Sienkiewicz's "Quo Vadis" treats of the reign of Nero and the life of the Apostolic Age, while Charles Kingley's "Hypatia" gives some idea of the intensity of the struggles of early Christianity in the Fifth Century. Coming to modern society, Hall Cain, in "The Christian," made the attempt to depict "the type of mind and character, of creed and culture, of social effort and religious purpose" which he found in the life of England at the close of the nineteenth century. Christ often comes into the midst of life in the guise of a human being as Manson in "The Servant in the House," the Stranger in "The Passing of the Third-floor Back," or the Travelling Man in Lady Grey's beautiful story of Irish life, whose inner spirit and meaning remind us so much of Henry Van Dyke's "Story of the Other Wise Man."

## V.

What are some of the tendencies of the more recent of modern fiction? It is difficult to classify some books, for often in the same book there is an overlapping of intellectual, moral, social and religious interests, its place in any repre-

sentative group depending altogether upon the emphasis placed upon a corresponding phase of life. But there are certain general streams of thought and influence that we can clearly trace and I should like to indicate a few.

First of all, there is a revolt against the dogmatic and an insistence upon the vital. There is a perfect hatred of shams and hypocrisy,—a reaction against the formalism that is content to cling to creeds that do not express the faith of today; and with this protest there is the demand for a more simple theological statement and mode of life. Professor Phelps, of Yale, thinks that "the terrific attack that Samuel Butler's 'The Way of all Flesh' makes upon professing Christians will be of real service to Christianity. The religion that Butler attacked is the religion of the scribes and Pharisees, and unless our religion exceeds *that*, none of us is going to enter the Kingdom of Heaven." We already see this reaction in an earlier and more constructive story in George MacDonald's "Robert Falconer," this reaction against a crude, false theology which embittered his soul and turned him away from God. Having passed through the awful agony of doubt he came at last into the clear light of truth and discovered that God was not a stern Judge whom he should fear but a kind Father whom he should love and serve. His religion is summed up in three brief propositions. "This is a healthy, practical, working faith: first, that a man's business is to do the will of God; secondly, that God will take upon Himself the care of that man; and, thirdly, and, therefore, that a man should never be afraid of anything."

Another strong tendency is toward an interpretation of our changing economic and social life. There is an emphasis upon that form of religion which demands economic righteousness and social justice. We see here the gradual development of the social conscience and understand more clearly some of the reasons for the widening breach between the working world and the organized Church. Ernest Poole's book, "The Harbor," takes us, not into a fair haven of rest and peace,

but into the noisy, dirty, stinking harbor where the great ships come and go, and deals with problems of commerce and religion. Upton Sinclair's "The Jungle" draws vivid and revolting pictures of the Chicago stock-yards. Jack London's "John Barleycorn" takes up the drink question. Of William Allen White's "A Certain Rich Man" the late Dr. Washington Gladden said: "In its ethical and social significance it is the most important piece of fiction that has lately appeared in America. I do not think that a more trenchant word has been spoken to this nation since 'Uncle Tom's Cabin.' And it is profoundly to be hoped that this book may do for prevailing mammonism what 'Uncle Tom's Cabin' did for slavery."

One of the books that has enjoyed a wide circulation is Winston Churchill's "The Inside of the Cup," and its popularity was due to its discussion of theological and religious questions no less than to its discussion of the dominant social and economic problems of the age. Some time ago I was thrown into conversation with a man who is intellectually brilliant, ruggedly honest, and intensely sympathetic toward the children of pain and oppression, a man who as an expert musician and skillful surgeon has in his temperament a strong combination of the artistic and scientific, a socialist entirely out of sympathy with the organized Church. I casually mentioned "The Inside of the Cup." "'The Inside of the Cup!'" he exclaimed, as his face lighted up with enthusiasm. "'The Inside of the Cup'? Why, that is the greatest book I have ever read! That has helped me more than any other to appreciate the real meaning of Christianity." More recently I sat in the private office of one of the foremost librarians of the country, a man of culture, an author, a university professor and a devoted Churchman. Again I mentioned "The Inside of the Cup." "'The Inside of the Cup!'" he cried out indignantly, as a frown darkened his brow. "'The Inside of the Cup'? Trash! Trash! Any man who can't distinguish between the immaculate conception and the Virgin Birth doesn't know his subject and what he writes is trash.

The book won't live." The difference in their attitude toward the book was due to their respective points of view. The one rejoiced in its ethical and social interpretation of Christianity which he felt would ultimately mean the salvation of the world; the other deplored its theological radicalism which he felt would mean, if unchecked, the disintegration of the Church and its final decay.

There is a demand for the novel which calls for a broad humanitarianism, revealing a brotherhood as wide as life itself,—a practical creed which issues in service. "V. V.'s Eyes," by Henry Sydnor Harrison, shows how the spirit of the gentle Christ helps to solve modern social problems, summing up, at the end, the whole purpose of the narrative in that classic saying in which Christ identifies his life with the common life of humanity, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." "The Passing of the Third-floor Back," by Jerome K. Jerome and "The Servant in the House," by Charles Rann Kennedy, are two of the books of "contemporary Scriptures" which constitute a part of what DeWitt Hyde called "the Gospel of Good Will." In the former the name of God is not even mentioned except in ejaculation, but we feel the contagious power of religion in the winsome, life-revealing personality of The Stranger. "My religion is very simple," says Manson in "The Servant in the House." "I love God and all my brothers."

Finally, there is that longing for some higher Power, mystically present, yet outside and beyond us,—that Power which men cannot define but need more than all else besides,—the insistent hunger of the soul for God, the reaching out toward the Infinite, the groping through the shadows of sorrow, ignorance and doubt for light, comfort, peace, truth, reality. Life never was intended to be cramped and narrow and selfish and limited, and it cannot attain its ultimate purpose and goal without God. We fain would cling to our little boats chained along life's shore, but mystic voices call to us

from the Great Beyond, and with stars above to guide us 'we put out at last to sea. Life and death and the life to come are what Louise Pond Jewell calls "The Great Adventure." In "The Way Home" Basil King tells us that it is not by the dark road of agnosticism that we find the "way home," but by simple faith in Christ. Mrs. Humphrey Ward's books are not considered great literature yet with all his faults Robert Elsemere reveals something of the intensity of the struggle between human passions and spiritual ideals. His atheism brought only unrest. He had peace only when he recovered his faith in God. He found God not through the intellect but through the heart. "We no sooner attempt to define what we mean by a Personal God," said Robert, "than we lose ourselves in a labyrinth of language and logic. No, we can't realize Him in words,—we can only live in Him, and die to Him." "Mr. Britling sees it through" is a fine psychological study, showing the mental and spiritual processes leading to Mr. Britling's consciousness of the need of God and his subsequent discovery of the God who alone can satisfy that need. The war, instead of robbing him of a shallow faith and driving him to despair, as in the case of so many people today, revealed to him the absolute necessity of faith in God. It is doubtful if Mr. Wells has added anything to his reputation by the publication of "The Soul of a Bishop." On the theory that "man's true environment is God" (which in itself may be correct), the Bishop of Prinschester, by means of a series of visions, finds this "true environment," and henceforth assumes for himself and demands for the rest of mankind the right to dispense with the worship of God in temples made with hands, and discards, as relics of the past, all those aids to devotion which have helped humanity thus far towards God. The device by means of which the Bishop had his first and second visions is decidedly unartistic. His discovery of God was not through a simple, profound, spiritual need incidental to experience, as in the case of Britling, but was dependent upon the administration of a powerful drug. The impression

we have of the Bishop is not that of a prophet, or a man of prayer, or a servant of humanity, or even a strong moral character whom we should like to imitate or follow. Our impression is rather that of a reformed dope-fiend who has been broken of his bad habits temporarily, but who, in his present state of poverty, will soon feel again the eternal discontent, and begin to worry, and get indigestion, and lose sleep, and crave for his Turkish cigarettes and only "twenty drops" of that "golden liquid" that will give him another vision of God! Where will Mr. Wells lead us to next? The seer of Patmos had a vision of the Holy City, coming down from God out of Heaven, and one of the striking features about that city was that it had no temple. "And I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it." But it is a question as to whether humanity has as yet reached that point in its spiritual evolution where it can dispense with the temple. Perhaps Mr. Wells is simply a little in advance of his age! If so, let us be patient with him for the present and give his Bishop time to "grow" in his newly-found spiritual environment. If Mr. Wells has planted in the garden of humanity's heart a new tree of life, we will judge it by its *fruits*.

I have now only rambled in reminiscent mood in this great world of fiction and merely touched the surface of its strange life, so mingled with tragedy and suffering, so warm with sympathy, so illuminated with hope and joy. Fiction interprets for us our world of lights and shadows, and helps us to realize that beneath all its movements, its struggles, its failures, its changes, its discontents, there is a yearning of the inmost heart of humanity for the Eternal. The war has created a new literature. There are poems, essays, autobiographies and short stories, but as yet comparatively few great books of fiction have appeared. But when they appear we shall see a new emphasis placed upon the moral and religious. We shall have a new ethical and spiritual interpretation of history and modern life. The world is waiting for



the prophets and artists who can interpret God and make Him the Supreme Reality, without whom life is a vain, empty shadow not worth the living. After all, whatever we may think of the "new religion" of the Bishop of Princhester, we yield to the force of Mr. Britling's conviction, wrought out in the hour of his deepest agony and greatest joy: "Religion is the first thing and the last thing, and until a man has found God, and been found by God, he begins at no beginning, and works to no end. He may have his friendships, his partial loyalties, his scraps of honor. But all these things fall into place, and life falls into place only with God. Only with God. God who fights through men against Blind Force and Night and Non-existence; who is the end, who is the meaning. He is the only King. . . . Of course I must write about Him. I must tell all my world of Him. And before the coming of the true King, the inevitable King, the King who is present wherever just men foregather, this blood-stained rubbish of the ancient world, these puny kings and tawdry emperors, these wily politicians and artful lawyers, these men who claim and grab and trick and compel, these makers and oppressors, will presently shrivel and pass,—like paper thrust in a flame."

SCRANTON, PA.

V.

A WAR OF FUNDAMENTALS.

JOHN W. APPEL.

If there ever was a war fought for primary rights it is the one in which we are now engaged.

At first it did not appear so. So far as was indicated on the surface the first object was to punish a nation for the assassination of an archduke. The next object was to prevent a smaller nation from being unduly humiliated by a larger one, and to preserve the balance of power among nations. At one time it was to defend the neutrality of a nation; then it was the freedom of the seas; then world dominion, then broken treaties, imperialism versus democracy, etc. It was all of these; but, as now appears, it was much more. From the start it was for the most primary and fundamental rights of mankind. The mask is now off, and we are face to face with the ugliest and most hideous specter that ever stalked the face of the earth. It has taken some years for us to come to the full realization of the fact; but the issue is now clearly drawn. When robbery, pillage, rape, piracy and murder were committed we thought it was justified or excused by extreme necessity. Now we are told that in the presence of an invincible power there can be no such thing as robbery, pillage, rape, piracy or murder; and when we complain of the violation of sacred treaties, the answer is that before such a power there can be no such thing as a binding contract.

It is on this theory that Germany has committed the foulest crimes of all history.

She has not only broken the laws of nations, the laws of war, of humanity and of God; but she openly and flagrantly

denies that there are any such laws. This carries the real contest back to the realm of ideas and first principles.

The President has stated the issue squarely in his address to Congress on February 26, 1917, where he says:

"I have spoken of our commerce and of the legitimate errands of our people on the seas, but you will not be misled as to my main thought, the thought that lies beneath these phrases and gives them dignity and weight. It is not of material interests merely that we are thinking. It is, rather, of fundamental human rights, chief of all the right of life itself. . . . I am thinking of those rights of humanity without which there is no civilization. . . . We are speaking of no selfish material rights but of rights which our hearts support and whose foundation is that righteous passion for justice upon which all law, all structures alike of family, of state, and of mankind must rest, as upon the ultimate base of our existence and our liberty. I cannot imagine any man with American principles at his heart hesitating to defend these things."

Also in his address to the same body, April 2, 1917, where he says:

"We are at the beginning of an age in which it will be insisted that the same standards of conduct and of responsibility for wrong done shall be observed among nations and their governments that are observed among individual citizens of civilized states."

The German view is just the opposite.

Count Helmuth von Moltke says: "War is a part of God's cosmic system."

Adolph Lasson says: "Force is the characteristic feature of right. In international intercourse, in consequence, there are and there can be no laws. . . . Between states there can be no thought of superior force, and hence there can be no thought of law and right. . . . Between states there can be but one form of right; the right of the strong. . . . Right and morality do not bind the will of the state, etc. . . . An agree-

ment entered into between the strong and the weak has no sense at all."

Treitschke says: "It is necessary, then, to choose between public and private morality, since the state is power its duties must rank differently from those of the individual."

Tannenberg says: "Humanitarian dreams are imbecility. Statesmanship is business. Right and wrong are notions indispensable in private life."

"The little people and the remnants of a people have invented a new word—that is, international law. In reality, it is nothing else than their reckoning on our good-natured stupidity."

Machiavelli stated the position exactly when he said the state was not controlled by morality, not by right, but by shrewdness; and when the salvation of the state was at stake one should not stop to inquire if the means resorted to are or are not permissible.

The issue has been met in times past in different ways. At one time it was, "Thus saith the Lord"; at another time it was "The Law of Nature"; then again it was "The Social Consciousness." In many cases it has been, as now, an appeal to arms.

The question is whether there are any divine laws, or laws of nature, or laws having the sanction of social consciousness, which nations are bound to respect.

As generally stated, among these primal or fundamental rights, so far as the individual is concerned, are the rights of life, liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness; and so far as the nations are concerned, the right of existence which involves the right of self preservation and defense, the right of independence or sovereignty, the right of equality (as Marshall tersely puts it: Russia and Geneva have equal rights); the right to respect; of commerce, jurisdiction, etc.

Then there are the rights of democracy, of sovereignty of the people, the freedom of the seas, the sacred obligation of contracts, the laws of war, etc.

All these rights have been variously designated as primary, elemental, intuitional, innate, inalienable and imprescriptable; which terms mean the same thing,—rights implanted in the human heart, recognizable everywhere and of force always independently of convention or positive law.

Perhaps the two greatest champions of the fundamentals of human freedom were Grotius and Rousseau.

They based their systems upon what they called natural rights.

Grotius spoke for the rights of nations, Rousseau for the rights of individuals.

The former defined nature law as the dictate of right reason, which he held to be so immutable that it could not be changed by God himself. "God himself," he says, "cannot make twice two not be four; and in like manner, he cannot make that which is intrinsically bad, not be bad."

His appeal was not so much to man in a state of Nature, or to a contract made in the primeval woods; as to the sense of justice, humanity and righteousness, evolved under the reign of God in the hearts and minds of thinking men.

On this principle, evidenced by the unwritten laws of nations, he condemned the massacre of prisoners, reprisals, and the slaughter of innocent non-combatants; the use of poisoned arrows or missiles, the poisoning of fountains, the violation of women, the destruction of temples, statues, and fruit trees. "Even the Goths," he says, "when they took Rome spared the temples."

While Rousseau appealed to man in a state of nature and made it the basis of the contract social, he also joined hands with Grotius in finding laws written upon the human heart.

Speaking of laws, he says that the most important of all laws is that "which is graven neither upon marble nor brass, but in the hearts of the citizens; it makes the true constitution of the state; it gathers new strength every day; when other laws grow old and pass away, it animates or replaces them; it keeps a people in sympathy with the spirit of its establish-

ments and insensibly substitutes force of habit for authority. I speak of manners, customs, and above all of public opinion."

The theory of natural law, as applied by these men, has been more or less of a stumbling block to science; nevertheless nearly all the principles which they contended for have become incorporated in the laws of states and nations outside of Germany. And when certain principles become so imbedded in our hearts as to become inherently obligatory, whether by natural evolution, custom, experience, utility, or divine fiat, they may certainly be spoken of as written in the human heart.

We believe in the evolution of the social idea; yet we believe in the reality of right, in the existence of conscience and a moral sense; and that certain primary and elemental laws are written in the human heart.

It is interesting to note the shade of difference between the American and the English view in the application of the theory. American jurists as a rule are naturalists or fundamentalists and apply primary principles to the interpretation of international law; while English jurists are positivists and only accept what has been agreed upon or settled by the common law.

With us international law is held to be part of the common law, and as such is "the law of all tribunals in the society of nations, and is supposed to be equally understood by all"; while with England, although a rule may be one generally recognized by international law, it will not be binding upon Great Britain until that country has consented to it. Her isolation and dominion over the seas has no doubt tended to foster this theory.

At the meeting of the American Bar Association, at Saratoga Springs, N. Y., in 1896, Lord Russell, Chief Justice of England, in a very able address on the subject of international law and arbitration, discussed the questions, whether there was any *a priori* rule of right or of reason or of morality which, apart from and independent of the consent of nations, was part of the law of nations; and whether there was a law



which nature taught, and which, by its own force, formed a component part of the law of nations. His conclusion was that, "while the aim ought to be to raise high its ethical standard, international law, as such, includes only so much of the law of morals or of right reason or of natural law (whatever these phrases may cover) as nations have agreed to regard as international law.

The view thus stated was a good deal modified by the Rt. Hon. Richard Burden Haldane, Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain, in an address on higher nationality, delivered before the same Bar Association, at Montreal in 1913; in which he pleaded for a more liberal interpretation of law. He contended that law was more than mere rules of conduct prescribed by the sovereign will of the state, that it could not be understood apart from the history and spirit of the nation, and that it had a real relation to the obligations even of conscience, and to what he termed the general will of society—the *Volonté Générale* of Rousseau. Here is where, he says, "writers like Bentham and Austin are deficient, one cannot read a great book like the *Spirit of Laws*, without seeing that Montesquieu had a deeper insight than Bentham or Austin, and that he had already grasped a truth which, in Great Britain at all events, was to be forgotten for a time." This general will, he says, manifests itself in public opinion which is often more effective than positive law.

But it must be stated to the credit of England, that notwithstanding her theories concerning *a priori*, or natural laws, she has nevertheless adopted or consented to nearly all the international laws sanctioned by the nations; and has consented to the right of intervention on the part of one nation in the affairs of another on moral and humanitarian grounds in extreme cases like those of Greece, Bulgaria, Cuba and the Philippines.

We are today in a welter of wrong, involving these elemental principles, worse than any the world has ever seen. The Allies in the trenches are fighting for the elemental things of

civilization, and we are back again to a state of nature. Is it any wonder our President makes fervent appeals for justice, righteousness and humanity; and finally only draws the sword in order that the most elemental things of life shall not be blotted out of the world? Certain it is that he spoke for the American people when he referred to that "intolerable thing" which was showing its "ugly face," a "thing without conscience or honor or capacity for covenanted peace"; and said it must "be crushed."

In other words, in dealing with Germany the Allies are dealing with an outlaw nation,—a nation that has repudiated and ignored all laws and all restraints of decency, humanity and honor. The indictment is a long one. She has broken every commandment of the law. She has wantonly murdered innocent non-combatants, including men, women and children, contrary to all recognized rules of warfare; she has desecrated temples, libraries and hospitals, outraged women, broken solemn promises and deliberately fired upon the Red Cross and shamelessly bombed hospitals. What we have been accustomed to regard as the most sacred things of life have been ruthlessly trampled in the dust; and we are asked to believe that between nations there are no such things as rights and duties, honor, justice, righteousness and law! It is not only democracy that is trembling in the balance, but Christian civilization itself. Even our religion is at stake, for we can never bow to the God of the Kaiser.

Shall all that is best and fairest in our civilization, then, as we view it, go down before the onslaughts of Prussian imperialism, or shall these fundamental rights be made safe for the world for all time to come? It is a battle for fundamentals, or natural rights.

Our boys in the trenches have come to realize that these rights are more precious than life itself. They know that if all other rights are denied them, one inherent, natural, infeasible, prescriptive right remains,—the right to fight for freedom and to avenge the crimes of an outlaw nation. These

boys know from bitter experience what a monster it is they are wrestling with. The philosophy of frightfulness is a grim reality for them. The cause appeals to them. They count it a glorious thing to yield up their young lives that this ugly spectre, this menace to civilization may be crushed.

They fully realize that in the ultimate analysis, this is a war for basic principles, more precious than life itself.

Take, for instance, perhaps the least moral question involved in the conflict, namely, the sanctity of contract. To maintain at this late day that a contract is of no binding force and may be broken at will is to go back to the earliest stages of barbarism. If the inviolability of contract is once undermined one of the main props of civilization is destroyed; for the principle of the contract lies at the very basis of all our dealings with one another as individuals and nations. And if we say this of the contract, what shall we say of life and liberty and property?

No doubt wars of wickedness have been waged in the past; but the hideous monster has usually resorted to some sort of subterfuge or camouflage to hide its head. This is the first time in the history of the world that any nation has openly questioned, nay defied, the fundamental principles of law, justice, righteousness and humanity. As against this philosophy of the war lord we need a revival of the philosophy of Grotius and Rousseau. Nay more, we need to turn anew to the dictates of humanity as exemplified in the Christian religion. It is one thing to assassinate an Archduke, but it is quite a different thing to assassinate Justice herself.

The decisive conflict must be fought out in the realm of ideas; and, whatever may be the outcome of the war in arms, in this realm there can be but one outcome,—the triumph of right against might, of justice over injustice, of righteousness over wrong. Public opinion will, must, dethrone this modern German philosophy and do it so effectively that its "ugly face" shall nevermore be seen to plague mankind.

“There is a serene Providence  
Which rules the fate of nations,  
Which makes little account of time,  
Little of one generation or race,  
Makes no account of disasters,  
Conquers alike by what is called defeat  
Or by what is called victory,  
Thrusts aside enemy and obstruction,  
Crushes everything immoral as inhuman,  
And obtains the ultimate triumph  
of the best race by the  
sacrifice of everything which  
resists the moral laws of the world.”

[Emerson's oration on the death of Lincoln.]

LANCASTER, PA.

## VI.

### THE CHURCH AND RECONSTRUCTION AFTER THE WAR.

PAUL SEIBERT LEINBACH.

The more thoughtfully a man considers this subject, the more fully will he be persuaded of the practical futility of his task. How could any mere editor be enamored of an undertaking that demands the combined talents of a prophet, a poet and a theologian, combined with the attributes of divine omniscience! We have to do here, not with history, but with prophecy. Never was there such a world-catastrophe as this—and the end is not yet. In this solemn time, amid such titanic changes that no man knows what a day may bring forth, let no one venture to describe the Church of to-morrow without the humble confession that he is dealing in speculation upon a theme concerning which there are probably as many judgments as there are thinkers. It may be quite safe to say the world will never be the same after the great war, but men differ tremendously in their estimate of the changes which will be brought about. Certainly it will be the same old world unless we have new people making a new world. A change of heart is the only hope for Germany—and for everybody else. "No social reconstruction can hold together without spiritual regeneration."

Many believe the changes after the war will be for the better; others are pessimistic enough to say that they will inevitably be for the worse. Some declare that the changes in the new era will be cataclysmic; old things will have passed away, all things will have become new; there will be a new heaven and a new earth; the peoples will find a new inheritance

and have a new song in their mouths. Forgetting the fate of many past prophecies which have resulted in disappointment and overthrow, some are throwing all caution to the winds and are forecasting definitely the conditions of the new age, with a special fondness for telling just what the soldiers are going to do and demand when they return. Many preachers, prominent laymen like John D. Rockefeller, Jr., journalists and publicists, are prophesying that there will be practically a *new religion* after the war, one great Church shorn of all division, ceremonialism and metaphysical creedal distinctions. One of the commonest predictions is that those who are fighting for the principles of democracy will return with a demand that all religious differences be abolished, all denominational distinctions wiped out, and one large creedless Church take the place of the present differing convictions and interpretations. Others appear to be convinced that the changes which will take place will not be fundamental and pervasive, but trivial and temporary. Perhaps with some "the wish is father to the thought," and they are merely wanting things to continue in the way the fathers walked. Thus *The Lutheran Herald* declares: "It has been stated that the war will give us a new religion. We hope not. We have enough new religion now. But what is needed is that people go back to the old religion. Gypsy Smith who has been working in the trenches in France reports that the old religion is having a glorious resurrection. Those who believe in the Gospel of Jesus Christ need no new religion. 'Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day and forever,' and He will continue to be as He has been in the past, the Light of the world, the only Saviour of men. The men in the trenches, face to face with death, can find strength and consolation in no other religion than the religion of 'Jesus Christ and Him crucified.' This is the message that the Christian soldiers like to hear, and it will be the religion of the Christian Church after the war as it was before. The eternal truths of God will never change. The change that is needed is not in the revealed religion but



in the hearts and minds of men who are wise in their own conceit and who are trying to make a new religion to suit their own vanity and selfishness and to be saved without repentance and faith. It is just as unreasonable and childish to believe that wars and revolutions in this world can change the Christian religion as to believe that these earthly upheavals will change the course of the heavenly bodies. But let us beware, lest in the excitement and confusion caused by the terrible desolation of this greatest war in history, we forget God and the gracious promises He has made to all who trust Him."

So, too, Dr. John Henry Jowett in his letter to his new congregation, Westminster Chapel, London, expresses himself on the question of the general outlook: "When the war is over, in what direction is our life to move? That will depend upon the passionate and sacrificial fidelity of the Christian Church. We have no need of a new Saviour. Jesus Christ is the very fulness of the eternal God and we are complete in Him. Nor is there any need of a new Gospel. The old Gospel is all-sufficient if it be vitally believed and convincingly lived by a Church which recognizes no other leader than her Lord. We may have to make some new emphases and unfold as never before Christ's conception of the Kingdom of God, and declare His purpose to establish that Kingdom upon the earth. And certainly we shall have to be heralds with more fervent accent and with a passion which divides its strength with nothing else. But more than ever do I believe that in the revelation of the holy grace and love of God in Jesus Christ our Lord, we have the vision and the dynamic of a new world in which old jealousies and old strifes and old meannesses and old wrongs will be transformed into a racial fellowship wherein Christ is all and in all."

In a vigorous editorial *The Presbyterian* says, "No man on earth knows when or how this world-rage is to end. That is God's secret and He has not yet revealed it. His hand is upon the nations and He will be honored on the earth. He

will be honored among the heathen. He will glorify His name. Any expectation that God's plans are to be defeated and man's thoughts prevail will surely meet disappointment. The American soldiers are not a lot of hysterical fellows. They are the very pick of our men, who come from all conditions of the American life and people. These men are intelligent, moral, godly, patriotic. Many of them are college bred, many are experienced in business, law, religion, education, in all their departments. Never was there a finer body of men to constitute an army. They have given themselves to their country, but they have not given themselves to a military life. When their duty is discharged they will either go to another world or return home in this one. When they come home, it will be with hearts too full of gratitude, joy and affection to find room for destruction. Nay, they know the principles upon which our national and social life rest and they will defend them. They will come back chastened. Their faith will be more real because they heard the voice of God in the storm. Many will have found their Saviour in the dark valley and they will never be untrue to Him. They will have maintained liberty and will prize it. From such men as this, Christianity and the Church and religious liberty need have no fear. They will love the Church of their fathers and mothers, and seek to maintain it. They will return, having secured liberty for all, and they will maintain it for all. Those hysterical people who are dreaming of the destruction of all things, and the suppression of all conviction and creed and religious intelligence, need not hope for help and succor from the returning soldier. He will be a tested man, a renewed man, a strong and broad man, and he will want peace and liberty both in Church and State. He will love the old Flag and the old Church, and he will defend both."

There is doubtless force in the arguments presented in the foregoing quotations, but in some instances the writers seem to much afraid of the breaking in of new truth, too certain that mediaeval creeds and the methods of former days cannot

be greatly improved upon. It seems to us, at best, a disheartening and rather hopeless point of view *to claim that the Church of antebellum days, without substantial modification, is able to meet the problems of reconstruction which, it is universally admitted, will be tremendous in their scope and significance. Let it not be forgotten that the Church of yesterday was not able to prevent this great world conflict, and as followers of Jesus Christ we cannot help praying daily and praying most earnestly that we shall have for the tasks of to-morrow a far better Church, cleansed, purified, filled with the Holy Spirit, a fit instrument for the accomplishment of the Divine purpose.*

In an able article on "The War and Church Unity," Dr. Miller recently said that "there are four outstanding fundamentals which this war is teaching us: (1) *The ideals of democracy, based upon brotherhood, service and freedom. This cannot be a matter of indifference to Christianity and the Church, for ours is a democratic religion, standing for the brotherhood of all men, and it has gotten on quite well with all sorts of aristocratic men and governments in the past, simply because it limited the range of its application of the Gospel it professed to believe.* (2) *The war is stressing the basic need of internationalism and revealing anew the fallacy of the assumption that every nation is a law unto itself. We are beginning to see that the war will not really end unless it ends in a concert of nations, definitely pledged to settle disputes by judicial and Christian methods and by the application of the highest standards of Christian ethics to the relationship of the nations of the earth.* (3) *The fundamental importance of the system and spirit of public education. As The Outlook recently declared, "Autocracy has not been imposed upon Germany by the sword; it has been wrought in Germany by the schoolmaster."* So must the ideals of service and brotherhood be taught in the schools and colleges of the free peoples of the world. (4) *The war has abundantly demonstrated the value and power of organization and united effort, revealing in all their wretchedness and folly the ap-*

palling divisions in the Church of Christ, which have made for impotence and disaster. The over-churching and overlapping at many places, and overlooking at many others, are the unanswerable evidences of a lack of coördination and genuine Christian statesmanship.

It has been said that Christian ministers have been the greatest obstacles in the way of overcoming "the selfish policy of denominationalism." They have, also, been the chief sufferers from this evil. The appalling government statistics, which reveal the average clerical salary in America to be \$663, less than the average wages of stablemen, hod-carriers, and day laborers at the present time, indicates how the present system is cursed by economic waste and lack of efficiency, with a tendency to develop still further sectarian prejudices in small communities. It is needless to picture here the pathetic and tragic tales which could be written about the struggles of these pitifully small organizations to keep their heads above water, the sacrifices of ministers and of the faithful few who were trying to make bricks without straw, suffering with poor equipment, thinly attended services, organizations too small to generate enthusiasm, and a chronic sense of failure that paralyzes effort.

Much might be written about the tendency to intellectualize religion, which has undoubtedly resulted from the over-emphasis upon creeds. Dr. Miller has well said that "*the Church has often used creeds as 'big sticks' with which to compel all men to believe what some men have believed.*" One of the wisest of our present-day Christian leaders, Dr. Coffin, has forcibly put the case thus: "The Church needs a moral narrowing and an intellectual broadening." We may well demand that the new Church for the new time will be less exacting in its intellectual tests, and far more exacting in its ethical tests. Let us never forget that with Jesus Christ the ultimate condition of acceptance is always moral and religious. His supreme demand was the doing of the will of God.

Forward-looking men are grateful that the old narrow notions are passing. They realize that the Church that would live must make adjustment to the spirit of the new time. The Gospel of the coming age will be social in its aspect. Nothing seems surer than that. This does not mean that it will be identified with social reform, but rather that it will be based on broad sympathy and heart experience. The minister must revise his plan. There will still be preaching, to be sure, but preaching will by no means be the whole task of the minister. A large part of his time will be taken in training his members for special service along lines of religious work. He will realize that *religion is in essence personal influence*, the radiation of personality. A Church will be judged not by the number of persons who go in, but by the number of workers who come out. As someone has said, "Christianity is simply the personal influence of the Christ type of men; it is the perpetuation of the personal influence of Jesus. Christianity has spread because men fall in love with the Christ kind of people." We have had in the Church of yesterday too much "impression without expression." The shortcomings of the past will not be cured by simply having more services, more sermons, or longer sermons, or by the addition of still more complicated machinery. The Church of the future will rather be the *working* Church which more fully translates its spiritual visions into actual practice in the laboratory of human helpfulness, forgetting itself in the service of mankind. The Y. M. C. A. is furnishing an up-to-date illustration of this practical Christianity, the value of which appeals to thoughtful men everywhere. Mr. E. H. Sothorn, the eminent actor, in his account of his experiences with the "Y" men in France, says that "one of the stated demands of that organization is men who inspire by service and not men who convert by argument." Men will not, in the last analysis, question either the vitality or the orthodoxy of the Church which follows in the footsteps of Him Who "went about doing good."

Dr. John R. Mott, the great Y. M. C. A. leader, has himself sounded a note of warning, however, when he says that "the Church has been producing Christian activities faster than she is producing Christian experience and Christian faith." In other words, she is allowing organization to take the place of spiritual life and enthusiasm, and with the multiplying of her social activities, she will be in even greater danger of substituting machinery for power. However, it is heartening to bear in mind that these multiplying agencies for serving mankind have all grown out of the Christian Church. And even if we admit that the Church in the immediate past has been "tried in the balance and found wanting," we can add, so also have education, science, international law, social idealism, and personal interest, every plan and every institution with which men, weak, fallible men, are identified. It will be enough to say that the chief and probably best justified criticism of the Christian Church in the years preceding the war was the fact that "*its influence upon social relations was so comparatively insignificant.*"

Now the task before the army of the Lord, though vast and difficult enough, is in its main outlines quite simple; for while evil is an abstraction, it takes concrete shapes and many of these are easily detected; drunkenness, lust, greed, dishonesty (especially in its more subtle forms), childhood frostbitten by too early toil, civic corruption, prostitution, tuberculosis, syphilis, bad housing, injustice toward weaker nations, unfair distribution of wealth, inadequate education. These are the first line trenches of the enemy upon which we would expect the Christian soldiers to wage vigorous and relentless war. In so exalted an enterprise as ours, we would naturally expect unity of aim, unshakable morale and an irrefragable resolution throughout the rank and file of the Christian army. And our expectations are apparently realized as we listen to the multitudes of voices rising in the swelling watchword,



"Like a mighty army moves the Church of God;  
Brothers, we are treading where the saints have trod;  
We are not divided, all one body we,  
One in hope and doctrine, one in charity."

This is indeed a noble sentiment; but we are living in a world of contradictions, and our most reasonable inferences often prove to be wrong. Strange as the admission may seem to one unacquainted with our ways and doings, the weight of our advance is not directed against the grim front of the enemy from which he makes frequent raids into our lines and captures many of our men, holding them in the prison-house of indifference and vice, for our general staff is divided into antagonistic groups, and much of our time and energy is spent in debate as to the proper weapons which should be used against our enemies. Many plans of campaign have been inherited from earlier generations and others are proposed from time to time by zealous partisans who can see no merit in any other method than their own. Thus the Christian army is often divided into various groups who work at cross-purposes and neutralize each other's strength in no small measure.

A new word like a new idea has a hard time in gaining rootage in the popular mind. This is especially true when it comes from an exotic source. Yet now and then, "fate blazons on the intellectual sky of the world a strange word which carries a large significance and lights up a new continent of thought." Such a word is the now familiar "Bolsheviki." A friend of the writer says, "There is no better word to apply to Protestantism." A few months ago, we would have had to guess if asked whether it was the surname of a Russian nobleman or Polish for "Mrs. Grundy." But Mars is a swift teacher, so that already every newspaper reader has some comprehension of its meaning. For most of us Bolsheviki connotes mental confusion, lack of social coördination, a group of scatter-brained leaders, each living in a paper world with no capacity to test the reality of its ideals or to relate them to the concrete experience of daily life. It

signifies the paralysis of a great nation's will so that notwithstanding the wonderful possibilities of the Russian people, in their hour of gravest peril they have been at least temporarily unable to defend themselves against the foe who has defiled their women, starved and murdered their children, looted their cities and corrupted their leaders. "This foe is determined to throttle their legitimate national aspirations and crush them under his heel; but instead of girding themselves against it they are spending their time and strength in debate as to the best means of gaining their freedom and are absorbing the noisy verbosity of demagogues in the delusion that it is wisdom. As spectators from afar, we are amazed at their ineptitude and wonder how a people who have given so many proofs of their worth have been so blind as to fall into this abyss of stupidity." Can it be true that Protestantism has suffered from a chronic Bolshevism? The ecclesiastical map of any American city seems to be conclusive proof of our lack of statesmanship and common sense religion. Its overlapping and conflicting parishes have resulted in a steady rivalry between different groups and even at the expense of others who are engaged in the same legitimate enterprise. The Church is far too often pitifully class-bound in outlook and sympathy. The impropriety of competitive methods adapted to attract the crowd does not seem to have suggested itself to many leaders. The wealthier congregations call the most attractive preacher they can demand, hire the best singers and performers on instruments and advertise through newspapers, bulletins, etc., that they have done so. They satisfy their consciences with the camouflage that their zeal for the unchurched has forced the adoption of commercial methods, but as a matter of fact they "do not care where the congregation comes from, so long as it comes." Can it be denied that this reduces religion to a business and puts it on a level inferior to the higher branches of art? With such Churches the chief aim is not to give life to the society in and for which they are supposed to exist, but rather to keep their machinery in

motion and maintain their organizations at any cost. They live *not to save the world, but to save themselves*. Why should we wonder that this develops a "parochial mind," especially in the weaker members of the clergy, who yield to the temptation to build up their own congregation at the expense of their brethren, even of those in the same denomination?

Does each Church have a *distinctive message* differing from that of all others? The uninitiated traveler from Timbuctoo would naturally think so, but except in the case of the reactionary clergy, this no longer holds true. There may have been a time when polemics formed the major part of the minister's vocation. We have to-day a happy situation in contrast with the bitter doctrinal debates and recriminations of a century ago. Enlightened ministers, who live in the new world of the twentieth century, realize that no Church has any prior lien upon the truth, and they feel "no special advantage over their neighbors who wear a different label." And yet, it is not true, as some claim, that we have achieved genuine unity. Our concord is more apparent than real. "It is a matter of small moment whether one group recognizes the validity of the orders of another group." Episcopalians are charged with inconsistency and severely censured for talking so much about unity and refusing to practise it by a frank recognition of the equality of the clergy of the other sects. Their position is unquestionably reactionary but this is a minor aspect of the question, after all. Practically, the Methodists and Baptists are no nearer each other and no freer from rivalry than they are with these bigoted Episcopalians, who deny that they are Churchmen.

Dr. MacCallum of Philadelphia has recently claimed that "there is no Church which is not sectarian, no matter how stridently it proclaims its catholicity." "The Kingdom of Heaven is the one inclusive system," he says; "the sectarian fabric of practically every Church is proven by its exclusion from its fellowship on external grounds of a host of men whose personal religion is undeniably of as fine texture as that of

those who make up its membership. The Baptist excludes from his communion everyone who has not been immersed, and when John D. Rockefeller, Jr., recently made the plea that immersion should not be required as a condition of membership, many of his brethren charged him with shameful disloyalty. The Episcopalian, not to be outdone in a superstitious reverence for what without asperity may be called the mechanics of religion, shuts the door upon all who have not been confirmed by a bishop. The Presbyterian takes a hand in fostering formalism and insincerity by barring from the ministry and eldership all who refuse to subscribe to the Westminster Confession of faith, thus elevating that antiquated document to a higher place than reason, conscience and the Bible. Such are the perversions of value to which the human mind is liable as it loses its way amid the eddies and back-currents of the river of truth. Now if anybody asks what is the real reason for the divisions of Protestantism when many have no distinctive message, the answer that we give is that we have to pay for the blundering experiments of our forefathers. We are not censuring them when we assess them with this responsibility, for they were children of their age and their merits were great, but they had the defects of their qualities and they fell far short of that infallibility with which an uncritical tradition has invested them. 'Faith of Our Fathers, Living Still,' is one of our popular hymns, but when we analyze the faith of our fathers, we find that often it was based on shifting ground so that the structure reared upon it seems doomed to fall sooner or later. And yet we cannot entirely free ourselves from the grip of the dead hand. For good or ill, these dead but sceptered sovereigns rule us from their urns. Historically, Protestantism has sometimes been less lenient with independence of thought than the Roman Catholic Church against which it so strenuously and effectively rebelled. *The Bible was rather universally regarded as an arsenal from which all might freely draw their weapons for theological fratricide.* And lest we should grow too optimistic

in these latter days, we must remember that there is still a religious underworld where a multitude of pious folk are zealously searching the Scriptures for cryptic proof of the coming of the Lord in the air and such attendant circumstances as the fall of the Kaiser or the destruction of the British Navy. Such is the tremendous inertia of superstition." Thoughtful men will agree that each sect is the product of a highly specialized tradition which tends to differentiate it from all others more and more, and thus to "augment its egoism." This is recognized in the apology which is perhaps most frequently made for sectarianism. It is claimed that each sect ministers to people of a different type. The Episcopal Church, for example, attracts the folks of æsthetic temperament, the Presbyterian appeals to those who desire stability of government and ordered simplicity of worship; the Methodist draws those who are naturally given to profuse enthusiasm; the Baptist is the haven of literalists; and the people who are most broadminded, sensible and brotherly are likely of course, to be found in the Reformed Church, and so on. This plausible justification, as Dr. MacCallum says, "has all the earmarks of a *post hoc ergo propter hoc* improvisation." It does not stand the test of analysis. There is no basis for it in Scripture nor in human nature. The normal man has all these qualities in different degrees. Nor does experience justify us in concluding that one Church produces the artist, another the thinker, still another the man of action. Moreover, this theory is utterly destructive of catholicity. "Such arguments are invented to undergird the *status quo*."

To give up cherished traditions, even though it is evident that they are not in accordance with facts, is for most folks a decidedly painful process, and any genuine reform or change in present methods must always meet a formidable barrier of vested interests. If a merger of the Churches were effected to-morrow, one trembles to think of the throng of officials, with comfortable salaries and optimistic outlook upon the *status quo*, who would be forced to revise both their system of thought

and their manner of living. It has been truly remarked that it "puts too severe a strain upon the idealism inherent in official human nature" to expect men to initiate reforms which will result in the loss of their livelihood. In these tremendous days, when the Church is nervous, unsteady, recognizing vaguely her loss of prestige, though not exactly understanding the reason why, when everywhere among the clergy there is questioning and unrest, *the supreme need of the hour is for priests who will minister at the altar of reality, men who will face the issues of the new era in the sacrificial spirit of Jesus, in the faith of the Son of God, and with a great passion for mankind.* Such a leadership will command the respect of the world by its integral moral authority, when the old sanctions are crumbling in the new order that is building. But "the sleep of Rip Van Winkle was only 'a midsummer night's dream' in comparison with the trance in which many Churchmen today are living, impervious to the light of the new age which has been flooding the world, continuing to place a pathetic dependence in the happiest exercise in which the typical ecclesiastical assembly can engage, namely,—the passing of resolutions," which resolutions are held in utter disregard, not only by most of the people, but often by the very men who support them, because that is deemed the proper thing to do at the time. Men who have faced reality in the trenches and have not shrunk from keeping a "rendezvous with death" will, we believe, have little patience with intellectual formulas and will not take seriously ecclesiastical mandates that they must accept this doctrine or that, as though truth were the creation of privileged assemblies.

Donald Hankey wrote: "The ordinary run of British soldiers never connected the goodness in which they believed with the God in Whom the chaplains said they ought to believe." And he rightly insisted that we must find our point of contact in showing men that Christianity is "the explanation and the justification and the triumph of all that they do now really believe in." Unfortunately, many of those who



are in control of the various ecclesiastical machines are putting their trust in formulas that are no longer vital, and clinging desperately to the hope that these can be galvanized into at least a semblance of life. They are like Dante's mistaken prophets, who were "doomed to walk with their heads reversed upon their shoulders so that even in moving forward they were always looking backward." Instead of recognizing the new issues, and visualizing the new fidelities which these issues ought to generate in alert minds, they are fumbling for their sanctions in second-hand experiences, and hoping for a fanfare of emotional revivals, such as took place a century or more ago, when the atmosphere of to-day is such as to make this hope utterly futile.

It is not a pessimistic wail but a common sense statement of fact when we remind ourselves that the darkest stain upon our Protestant escutcheon is *the neglect of religious education*. Much of that which we have called by this euphonious name was a farce and a fraud. Children have been so neglected that ignorance of the Bible has become a scandal. Even among college students from pious Protestant homes, this ignorance is so profound that it would discredit a claim for general culture even in a young Buddhist or Moslem. How then will statesman-like coöperation and victorious conquest be possible? "Not from a study of the findings of the ancient councils and a compromise on the artificial platforms which they offer," answers a distinguished minister; "the twentieth century man will never consider their decisions as binding, anyhow. That day has gone never to return. They have only a historic interest." Unity and progress and victory will only be born in the Christianizing of our leadership, and this Christianization will be registered in the willingness of us all to throw our positions, our privileges, our traditions, our most sacred symbols, into the crucible of a divine passion for the spiritual nurture of all mankind. A divided and irresponsible Protestantism is on the down-grade. The writing is on the wall for the eyes of all those who can read it. Already the Y. M.

C. A. in England is planning its course of action for after the war. It is proposed to put "huts" into every village in the United Kingdom. Doubtless, it will also exercise a wider ministry here than in the past, and will sap the vitality of the Churches if they refuse to consolidate for aggressive action against the forces of evil. The Entente Allies have given us a striking illustration of the value of a unified leadership. They suffered many a disaster before each nation was willing to subordinate its particular interest to the common aim and work. Perhaps the Church will have to become much weaker and suffer much more before this ideal of practical coöperation is reached, but "unless Protestantism wishes to commit Hari-Kari, we must face the issue and make the sacrifice."

Mr. William T. Ellis, the well-known newspaper correspondent, recently wrote: "Please God, the day for sectarian controversy is passing. This war is lifting us all up above the littleness and bigotry and bitterness of the strife between Churches that has marred so much of Christian history. We are following the men at the front into a new understanding of the great simplicities and verities of our common Christian heritage; and brotherhood and ministry, as taught by Jesus, are meaning more to us than all the distinctive claims of all the jarring creeds." Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin's Yale lectures, entitled, "In a Day of Social Rebuilding," made up of eight stimulating chapters on the Church and its ministry in the present age, may be regarded as perhaps the timeliest of all current publications, and it will be found to be a dollar well spent for any preacher to study that splendidly practical counsel of a great preacher and teacher. It brings in virile form the message that "in every age the Church must recast its worship and restate its teaching to meet the immediate necessities of men."

In the existing situation with all its handicaps, there is one consideration which affords no little consolation to all the friends of Christ; *the divinity of the Church's commission is established by the fact that, notwithstanding all the grave*

*blunders and inconsistencies of which her leaders and members have been guilty, the Church is still such a power for good in the world.* The Divine approval has never been withdrawn, or the folly and sin of professing Christians would have destroyed the Church long ago. Instead of encouraging us to hold on our present fatuous way, this, of course, should inspire us to visualize the glory that will be ours when we are ready to bury sectionalism and parochialism, renounce our selfishness, and really make the interests of the Kingdom of God our supreme motive and concern.

Let us thank God that religion today is found to be not simply a luxury, but a necessity for increasing numbers of men. The quickened sense of social obligation, the new kindling of social hopes, the growing conception of the importance of coöperation, which really means *the corporate organization of the Christian forces*—all these augur a new era of power and influence for the Christian Church. If the Church rises to meet this tide, her potency for good in the new day will be tremendously multiplied. No longer shall we have the individualism which made personal relations with God almost the entire content of religion, and relations with fellow-believers and non-believers matters of little moment; the call of tomorrow will be for *a regenerated social order in which souls that are being saved shall be "built up into fair-sized sons and daughters of God."* It will cost much to meet this challenge; but it will be worth all it costs—and more. The late Dr. Marcus Dods phrased it well when he said, "I do not envy those who have to fight the battle of Christianity in the twentieth century. Yes, perhaps I do, but *it will be a stiff fight!*"

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

## VII.

### NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

#### WAR LITERATURE.

The great war has produced many books. The pen has vied with the sword in attempting to settle the issues at stake. The vast majority of these books will not survive the clash of arms. Even now they are being supplanted by another class of books, less epic and dramatic, and more interpretative and prophetic. They deal with the larger meaning of the war. The military and political aspects are subordinated to its moral and spiritual significance. They are not the sad records of destruction, but hopeful programs of reconstruction. They deal with the establishment of a new social order in which Kaiser and Kaiserism shall be no more.

It may be taken as a happy omen that, with scarcely a dissenting voice, these books take a hopeful view of the future. They do not minimize the difficulties that will confront the allied nations, and their vanquished foes, after the military conflict shall have been brought to a victorious conclusion. But they have faith in the moral and spiritual resources of mankind. Their belief, that the end of the war will mark the beginning of a new era in history, rests on the hope that these latent resources will be mobilized for a decisive victory over the evil forces of sin and selfishness in every form and in every land.

These books should find a welcome in every American home. No greater duty confronts intelligent Christian men at this time than to think through, to their last and deepest meaning, the issues of this destructive war. Books that pursue this aim are Christian literature in the highest sense. They are material aids for the promotion of the kingdom of God in our time. It would be fine Christian statesmanship, and altogether proper, to introduce some of them into adult Bible classes, and similar church organizations, for study and discussion.

The REVIEW presents to its readers the following selected list of books dealing, in a constructive spirit, with the moral and spiritual significance of the war:

- THE CHURCH AND THE MAN.** By Donald Hankey. The Macmillan Company, New York. Price 60 cents. Pages xx + 89.  
**THE NEW HORIZON OF STATE AND CHURCH.** By William H. P. Faunce. The Macmillan Company, New York. Price 60 cents. Pages 1-96.  
**THE TWENTIETH CENTURY CRUSADE.** By Lyman Abbott. The Macmillan Company, New York. Price 60 cents. Pages xii + 110.  
**PATRIOTISM AND RELIGION.** By Shailer Mathews. The Macmillan Company, New York. Price \$1.25. Pages 1-161.

- THE CHRISTIAN MAN, THE CHURCH AND THE WAR. By Robert E. Speer. The Macmillan Company, New York. Price 60 cents. Pages 1-105.
- RELIGION IN A WORLD AT WAR. By George Hodges. The Macmillan Company, New York. Price, \$1.00. Pages 1-103.
- THE WAY TO LIFE. By Henry Churchill King. The Macmillan Company, New York. Price 60 cents. Pages 1-129.
- RELIGION AND WAR. By William H. P. Faunce. The Abingdon Press, New York. Price \$1.00. Pages 1-188.
- THE CLEAN SWORD. By Lyman Harold Hough. The Abingdon Press, New York. Price \$1.00. Pages 1-211.
- AMERICA—HERE AND OVER THERE. By Bishop Luther B. Wilson. The Abingdon Press, New York. Price 75 cents. Pages 1-107.

The name of Donald Hankey, the author of the first-named volume, has become a household word throughout Christendom. He was unknown before the war. But his wonderful articles in *The Spectator* (now published in book form, with the title *A Student in Arms*) won him instant recognition. It is easily the most religious book about the war. And its author is one of the most genuinely Christian men of our generation, whose appreciation and interpretation of the "inarticulate religion" of the soldiers at the front, while shocking ecclesiastical pride and theological conceit, are destined to become a vital factor in the reconstruction of the Church for the new era.

In *The Church and the Man* one finds the same fundamentally religious spirit as in the *Student in Arms*—critical, but never cavilling; solely intent upon making Christ "the Lord of all good life." His avowed aim is, "to try to help find out how we can make the Church a better, a more efficient, a more vital, a more healthy body for our Lord Jesus Christ." In that humble, helpful spirit he discusses "An Average Man's Beliefs and Troubles," "The Church and Human Relations," and many things besides. His death in battle, in 1916, has stopped the busy pen of Donald Hankey. But his spirit lives in multitudes whose faith in God and man his writings have clarified and confirmed. And his influence will be felt for many years after the war.

Dr. Faunce, the president of Brown University, has frequently enriched our religious and educational life with his writings. We rather looked for some heartening utterance from him in these trying times. This expectation is fully met in the two volumes mentioned above. *The New Horizon of State and Church*, as the title suggests, deals with these hoary institutions in the light of the new world conditions of today. Deep moral insight, wide historical knowledge, sound political sense are fused into a splendid discussion of the opportunities presented by the war to patriotism and piety. The titles of the four sections into which the text is divided are, The Return of America to the Founders, The Return of Christianity to Christ, The Function of the Christian Patriot, Obstacles to the International Mind.

The other volume from the pen of President Faunce, entitled *Religion and War*, consists of the Mendenhall Lectures delivered at De Pauw University. This series of addresses is especially recommended to those who are seriously perplexed by pacifism, and to those who see in this war the bankruptcy of the Church and the collapse of Christianity. They will find in this volume a scholarly investigation of the attitude of the Bible towards war, and a conclusive refutation of pacifism. The author sees clearly that "Christianity cannot permanently tolerate war." But he makes it equally clear that to the Christian there is one thing worse than war—"the failure to resist evil, the compromise with unrighteousness for the sake of quiet days, and the unwillingness to die that truth may live." The closing chapters of the book are a vigorous challenge of the Church to assume moral leadership in the rebuilding of a fairer world on the ruins of the present world.

Dr. Lyman Abbott's book bears the significant title, *The Twentieth Century Crusade*, which in itself is a sufficient explanation of his conception of the ultimate meaning of the war. The pages of *The Outlook* have made it familiar to the nations of the Allied World. In this little book Dr. Abbott makes free use of his editorial utterances. But it is more than a reprint of sermons and articles. Both in substance and form, it is distinctive contribution to the war literature.

"This book is written for those who are sharing in the great sacrifice of this world's Golgotha." The reader will find that promise of light in darkness and of comfort in suffering amply fulfilled. The volume is radiant with those spiritual consolations and aglow with those moral assurances which make the Allied World akin, whether Jew or Gentile, Catholic or Protestant, agnostic or believer. There is a beautiful introduction, entitled *The Three Crosses*. Alluding to the tragedy enacted on Calvary, it portrays the modern analogy. The whole world is being crucified on three crosses; the one bearing an unrepentant brigand; the other, a repentant sinner; the last, multitudes who are suffering for sins they never committed.

The body of the book consists of Nine Letters, each of them casting its ray of benign light upon some darkness or difficulty arising out of the war. They are the epistles of a modern saint in whom Christian love does not lose its prophetic ire. They will bring comfort and conviction to many a perplexed and wounded spirit. In the letter entitled *The Peacemakers*, on pp. 31 sq., the reader will find the passage on praying for the forgiveness of the Kaiser which has been widely discussed. To the reviewer, Dr. Abbott's negative attitude on this question, however moderately stated, constitutes the one regrettable utterance in an admirable



book. The solution of the puzzling question whether one should pray for the Kaiser's forgiveness must be sought in a Christian interpretation of forgiveness, but not in an arbitrary limitation of prayer. The regret one feels is softened by the conviction that the reader who becomes imbued with the noble spirit of the book will be the first to disregard the author's personal resolution not to pray for the Kaiser.

Dean Shailer Mathews is well known to the readers of the REVIEW. His many books on the social interpretation of Christianity have given him an honored place among the major prophets of the changing order. His latest volume, *Patriotism and Religion*, furnishes new evidence of his deep spiritual insight into the ultimate foundations of human welfare, of his burning social passion to extend the reign of righteousness and love, and of his militant ambition to arouse organized Christianity to its divine task, whose urgency and opportunity have been immeasurably increased by the war. This book is less popular and more scientific than the volumes reviewed above. It is also more rewarding to the student who follows the author's discussion of the close relationship between religion and patriotism.

In four lectures, which were originally delivered at the University of North Carolina, on the McNair Foundation, this volume deals, respectively, with The Kinship of Patriotism and Religion, The Moral Value of Patriotism, Religion and War, The Service of Religion to Patriotism. These four lectures are "a sincere attempt to estimate two of the spiritual forces that underlie social evolution." These two forces, Patriotism and Religion, are broadly traced in their historical development, and in their reciprocal relation. One of the main objects of the author is to show the radical difference between the two types of religious patriotism and patriotic religion found, respectively, in autocratic and democratic countries. The reader of Dean Mathew's book will learn to understand the Kaiser's religion and his "Gott," without doubting his sincerity or his sanity. And he will close the book with a deeper devotion to the religion of Jesus and to His God. The Kaiser's deed finds its logical support in his medieval creed. His theory of the divine right of kings to do what they please is matched by his faith in Divine Might enthroned in the heavens. But Jesus makes right, not might, supreme in heaven and on earth. His religion sounds the death knell of every autocracy in the universe. Dean Mathew's book pleads for a more thoroughgoing translation of our Christian creed into terms of life. The war does not prove that Christianity is a failure; but it does reveal, in startling fashion, that the Church has failed to perform her social mission adequately. The volume is a noble challenge to the Church to democratize its religion and to spiritualize democracy.

The reviewer calls special attention to the section of the book dealing with the charge that the war is the logical outcome of German higher criticism, and with the modern revival of chiliasm (pp. 126 sq.). His trenchant, and somewhat indignant, refutation of these stupid attacks upon modern methods made by the champions of reaction, and of the perversion of Jesus' gospel of the kingdom, are fully warranted by the menace that lurks in this Christian obscurantism. A Church committed to such positions would be hopelessly out of touch with an age whose ruling spirit is scientific and social. An unscientific theology, that elevates conformity to a dogmatic system above loyalty to truth and fact; and an unsocial religion, that calmly awaits the speedy destruction of the world, have no message and no ministry for the era after this war.

On page 143 the author discusses the burning question whether we can love our enemies. His answer is, "Yes, we can love them, but we cannot like them." That is not quite the popular answer. But neither is it the Christian answer. It looks very much like a piece of ethical legerdemain, not at all in keeping with the tonic moral quality of the rest of the book. Certainly, to say that we must love our enemies but cannot like them, is not a vital solution of a very real difficulty. It will confirm the moral confusion widely prevalent on this question of applied Christianity. If love is the sentimental affection that accompanies approval, then we cannot love our enemies. We certainly do not approve of the Germans. But if love is good will, the desire to seek the highest good of all men, then we must love even the Germans. And it is specious to draw hair-spun distinctions between "love" and "like." Such love is neither sentimental nor soft. It can, on occasion, smite the sinner, and even slay his body, because the highest good of men demands, above all other things, resistance to evil.

Dr. Speer's messages, spoken at many missionary gatherings, are noted for their spirituality and sanity. The same qualities mark his little volume, *The Christian Man, the Church and the War*. Without in the least abating his loyalty to Christ, even in the matter of loving one's enemies, the author is splendidly loyal to humanity in its conflict with inhumanity.

*America—Here and Over There* consists of the war addresses of Bishop Wilson. The publishers have done well to give wider publicity to these patriotic utterances by gathering them into this attractive book. It contains eight brief chapters whose snappy headings suggest that they are not critical essays but the outflow of a heart filled with great experiences at the front. It is flawless, both in its flaming patriotism and in its glowing religious fervor. This Methodist Bishop is militant, but not a mili-

tarist. His patriotism rings true as steel, but it is far-visioned. As a record of stirring history and as a Christian interpretation of it, this little book deserves wide reading. The closing chapter contains a collection of brief prayers suitable in war time.

*Religion in a World at War*, by Dean Hodges of the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge, Mass., consists of eight sermons on the war. They represent modern preaching at its best. Without being burdened with technical theology, they offer meat to men. They apply the great principles of the Christian faith to the religious problems raised by the war. The themes of the sermons are: In the Storm of War, Easter in a World at War, Memorial Day in a World at War, All Saints' Day in a World at War, Christmas in a World at War, God and the World's Pain, Pain and the World's Progress, The Everlasting Vitality of the Christian Religion.

*The Way to Life*, by Henry Churchill King, President of Oberlin College, is "a revised and enlarged reprint of those portions of the author's *Ethics of Jesus* dealing with the Sermon on the Mount, with a special discussion of the war and the teaching of Jesus." The larger part of this book is thus a reproduction of the last four chapters of President King's well known *Ethics of Jesus*. Without material change of content, these reprinted portions have been broken up into fourteen short chapters, with many sections, for the convenience of students. Two added chapters contain the bearing of the teaching of Jesus upon war. They set forth, The Logical Consequences and Implicit Assumptions of Extreme Pacifism, and The Meaning of the Teaching and Example of Jesus.

There is no lack of homiletical literature on the Sermon on the Mount. But there are not many books that make the Spirit of Christ, as expressed in the Sermon on the Mount, the constructive principle of Christian Ethics. Among these the volume under review holds a prominent place. It is a book of special timeliness and value, for it makes its appearance at a time when the world is eagerly searching for a sound basis of international morality, and for an adequate dynamic to erect upon it a permanent civilization. It will find both in the standards and ideals of Jesus Christ as expressed in the Sermon on the Mount. President King's book must be regarded as an important contribution to the constructive thinking of the era now dawning.

*The Clean Sword*, by Lynn Harold Hough, Professor of Historical Theology in Garrett Biblical Institute, is advertised as "An Interpretation of Civilization, A Revelation of the Mistakes of Pacifism, and A Vigorous Defense of America's Part in the Great War." That is a large aim for a book of two hundred pages. But it is admirably achieved. Like a triple chord this

purpose runs through every chapter of the book, gathering force and clearness as the argument proceeds, and binding the whole of it into a consistent unity.

The author defends the proposition that "a sword has no character until you use it. There is nothing fundamentally good about it. There is nothing fundamentally bad about it. It is ethically neutral until it is drawn and wielded; and then the cause gives character to the sword." He deals fairly and squarely with the two groups who would challenge these plausible statements; with the pacifists who denounce the sword as inherently bad; and with the militarists who idolize it as inherently good. Then, in successive chapters, he describes, in vigorous language, with many apt illustrations, the splendid function of the "Clean word" as the protector of Law, Civilization, Justice and Brotherhood. This illuminating discussion reaches its culmination in three chapters entitled, respectively, *The Sword of Christ*, *The International Sword*, *The Sword of Peace*. One could not ask for a finer blending of spiritual insight and practical sagacity than is here revealed. "Soiling the Clean Sword" is the title of a chapter devoted to a frank discussion of the moral perils of the military life, and of the counter-active agencies at work among our American soldiers.

The book closes with a picture of "The Clean Sword of the Future." Here, again, the author is prophetic without being visionary. His Christian idealism does not part company with sober realism. He sees men and things as they are in a growing universe that is going towards the kingdom of God, but is still far from the goal. Hence the author expects no permanent sheathing of the clean sword in the immediate future. But the only sword unsheathed will be a clean sword in a good cause.

THEO. F. H.

### THREE NOTABLE BOOKS ON IMMORTALITY.

The great war has immensely quickened men's faith in immortality. Before the war, multitudes of men lived in selfish materialism, with the inevitable result that faith in the immortality of the soul faded from their spiritual vision. Then came the summons to serve and suffer for righteousness's sake. Millions of men lived and died for ideal and spiritual aims. They began to practice immortality, and many achieved it in battle. That wonderful experience became the fertile soil for renewed spiritual longings and convictions. Out of it was born the moral certainty that there is in man a deathless spirit. A certain chaplain reports that, in two years in the trenches, meeting thousands of men, he found none that doubted the immortality of the soul.

This revival of the personal religious experience of immortality has, naturally, led to many attempts to state, and restate, the biblical and rational grounds for this assurance. These theological and theoretical discussions of immortality have formed a distinctive phase of our war literature. Among the publications of this class, the three following deserve special mention:

IMMORTALITY, AN ESSAY IN DISCOVERY, CO-ORDINATING SCIENCE, PSYCHOLOGY, AND BIBLICAL RESEARCH. By B. H. Streeter (editor). The Macmillan Company, New York. Price \$2.25. Pages xiv + 380.

CAN WE BELIEVE IN MORTALITY? By James H. Snowden. The Macmillan Company, New York. Price \$1.25. Pages 1-227.

THIS LIFE AND THE NEXT. By P. T. Forsyth. The Macmillan Company, New York. Price \$1.00. Pages 1-122.

These three volumes are quite unlike in character. The first is "An Essay in Discovery"; the second, a plausible and persuasive challenge to possess the discovered land; the third, a revaluation of this present life in the light of the next. But in spite of their marked differences, they breathe one spirit and lead to the same goal. Their common spirit is that of chaste reserve concerning things unknown. They profess to know less than the older books about the exact nature and conditions of the hereafter. Moreover, their professed knowledge about immortality is of the kind that does not stultify our reason nor violate our conscience. It is in full accord with the best rational and moral insight of modern men. And their common goal is the confirmation of the yearning of mankind for continued existence, and the vindication of the Christian hope of personal immortality.

The Rev. B. H. Streeter is well known to American readers as the editor of "Foundations" and "Concerning Prayer," and as the author of "Restatement and Reunion." The present volume appears under his editorship. Two of its nine chapters are from his pen. The others are contributed by four representative English scholars. "Immortality" may be regarded as a companion volume to "Concerning Prayer." It matches that previous work in the soundness and breadth of its scholarship, and in its reverent and positive attitude toward vital religious values. It deserves the widest reading as representing the best modern thought on immortality in various fields of research and investigation.

The book consists of nine weighty essays, each filling a chapter. "In the first three, the main arguments for the belief in personal immortality are set forth in a logical sequence. The three following essays deal with the nature of the after-life, and discuss the meaning and value for modern thought of conceptions like Resurrection, Judgment, Heaven, and Hell. The elements of truth and error in Spiritualism and in the doctrine of Reincarnation, more especially in relation to the claims made on



its behalf by modern Theosophy, are presented in the next two essays. The last essay, *The Undiscovered Country*, forms, as it were, an Epilogue to the whole collection." The book deals with profound matters, but it is written in a lucid style. Comprehensive synopses, preceding each essay, and carefully prepared indexes of subjects and names, at the end of the volume, measurably enhance its value for students.

It is to be expected that a book, dealing frankly and scientifically with topics of such vast scope and intrinsic difficulty, will challenge criticism and invite dissent. Its contributing authors are fully aware of that. But even the dissenting critic will not deny them his appreciation of the extremely intelligent effort made in this book to lift the thick veil that shrouds the next world with darkness; nor withhold from them his glad recognition that, jointly, they have made a valuable contribution to the literature on immortality.

*Can We Believe in Immortality?* by Professor James H. Snowden, may be called a Thesaurus of our knowledge of immortality. In thirty-five brief chapters, averaging six pages, the author presents a complete survey of the field. He discusses immortality from every point of view: scientific, psychological, historical, ethical, religious, and experimental. Every difficulty is fairly stated; every doubt is frankly faced; every solution is fearlessly discussed. In its candor and comprehensiveness, it is the most modern and satisfactory book on this topic known to the reviewer. The conclusions reached by the author are positive and constructive. A dominant note of the entire volume is the meaning of immortality in the light of the great crisis through which the world is passing. Professor Snowden's book should bring its comforting message, its tender consolations, and its luminous truths into thousands of bereaved homes and to the multitudes whose hearts are perplexed.

Principal Forsyth's little book, *This Life and the Next*, is a rather unique contribution to the literature on immortality. It reverses the customary method of writing about immortality in that it reasons from the conclusion to certain premises. The author is not concerned about "the basis of a belief in immortality, but about its moral rebound." Faith in immortality is taken for granted. The question discussed is: the reaction of that great belief upon this life. Of the religious value of such a discussion there can be no doubt. It will tend to rescue immortality from the realm of nebulous speculation and sentimental longing, and help to restore it to the precincts of practical life, which is its native sphere. It is needless to add that the book possesses all the cogency of thought, and all the pungent brilliancy of style for which its author is famous.

THEO. F. H.



**THE THREE RELIGIOUS LEADERS OF OXFORD AND THEIR MOVEMENTS, JOHN WYCLIFFE, JOHN WESLEY, JOHN HENRY NEWMAN.** By S. Parkes Cadman. The Macmillan Company, New York. Price \$2.50. Pages xv + 596.

This massive volume, from the pen of a busy pastor, grew out of a course of lectures given at The Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences. It enshrines the memory of three great men—Wycliffe, Wesley, and Newman—and, incidentally, the fame of Oxford, their *alma mater*, whose great history is so intimately intertwined with the story of English life and letters.

It may seem almost like a work of supererogation to erect another stately literary monument to these three religious leaders of Oxford. They have by no means been neglected by the students of English history and of the evolution of religious thought. Every competent church historian has recognized their importance. There are numerous monographs on each of the three leaders, and authoritative studies of all of them. It may be asserted, therefore, that their historical significance is well understood in its genetic relations backward and forward. We understand the forces whose outcome they were, and the movements whose originators they became. One does not expect a new book to reveal unsuspected historical relationships, or unknown facts of importance in the lives of these men and in the larger movements of their times. The informed reader of Dr. Cadman's book will find abundant corroborative evidence of the power of this triumvirate and of their place in history, but nothing that would compel a radical readjustment of previous estimates.

In spite of these inevitable limitations, Dr. Cadman's book fills an empty niche among the chronicles of dominant personalities. Its claim to recognition does not rest upon originality of research, nor upon exhaustive treatment of the three separate topics, but upon the success with which the author sketches, in large outlines, the periods of English life dominated by the three religious leaders; upon the skill with which he fills the outlines with minor characters of importance; and upon the literary artistry displayed in a vigorous style and in a lucid presentation. What might easily have been a confusing mosaic of many parts proves to be three good portraits of great men set in a panorama of English life.

Thus Dr. Cadman's book is much more than biographical studies of the three great Oxonians. The lives of the "Morning Star of the Reformation," of the founder of Methodism, and of the leader of the Tractarian movement are merely the connecting threads of a much wider range of thought. Even "their movements," which forms a part of the title of the book, is an inadequate description of its rich contents. Set about the lives of the

three leaders, and linked with the movements which they expressed and inspired, the reader of the book will find in it a succinct amount of all the significant currents of thought and action in the periods under survey.

It is no small merit, for any man, to serve as a trustworthy guide through remote eras, filled with complex trends and tendencies and fraught with immense consequences for all future ages. And Dr. Cadman is thoroughly trustworthy in his critical and ethical appreciation of the historical forces that became incarnate in Wycliffe, Wesley, and Newman. He brings to his task every requisite of knowledge and insight. One may, indeed, question the association of Newman with the other two. No one, certainly, would contend that he ranks with them in importance as a creative personality in the religious life of England, and much less of the world at large. But, that apart, the Third Book, devoted to the great Tractarian and to the Oxford Movement of 1833-1845, contains one of the clearest accounts to be found anywhere of that interesting episode in Anglicanism.

As a popular presentation of three great men, their times and tendencies, their origin and influence, the book deserves earnest recommendation. It is true to fact, catholic in spirit, judicious in emphasis, lucid in style, logical in presentation. Perhaps no other existing volume can take its place for the ready and reliable orientation and information of intelligent men who lack the time or opportunity for detailed scientific study of the topics discussed. Carefully selected bibliographies and a good index are appended to the book.

THEO. F. H.

JOHN H. A. BOMBERGER. Centenary Volume. The Publication and S. S. Board of the Reformed Church, Philadelphia, Pa. Price \$1.50.

This is a brief story of the life and labor of Dr. Bomberger, written in a pleasing style and worthy of careful reading by the members of the Reformed Church. It is edited by Professor Geo. Leslie Omwake, president of Ursinus College, Rev. James I. Good, D.D., and Rev. Calvin D. Yost.

Two sons, Rev. John H. Bomberger and Henry A. Bomberger, have each written a chapter. Other chapters are written by Professor Omwake, Dr. Good, Rev. C. D. Yost, Rev. E. R. Appenzeller and Rev. J. Hunter Watts.

The book was given to the public on the centennial of the birth of Dr. Bomberger, January 13, 1917. It tells the story of his early life, student days, pastorates at Lewistown, Waynesboro, Philadelphia; twenty years as college president, his theological views and the closing days of his life.

With so many different writers the unity of the book would surprise us if we did not know that all the writers came under the influence of his great life.

When Dr. Bomberger began his career there were but 138 ministers in the Reformed Church. Congregations were scattered. Members were indifferent. Dr. Nevin said the Church was asleep. The slowness to adopt the English language in our services led many young people into English-speaking denominations. Our modern spirit of tolerance and fellowship was lacking. Men who were recognized as leaders had no patience with those who might differ from them in method or in doctrine. Because of this we lost men like Otterbein, who, desiring a deeper spiritual life and evangelistic methods, went out and founded the United Brethren Church. Weinbrenner, who founded the Church of God, and other strong men left us. But Dr. Bomberger went into the bitter controversy of his day, determined to be loyal to the truth as he saw it and to the Reformed Church. In fact in those large lustrous eyes there flashed and flamed a great soul that gloried in a fight. Controversy has its place in the development of the individual and institution. Our leaders today are so busy with constructive work and they see so much to admire and love in those who may differ with them that they do not take time for controversy.

But when institutions failed to teach what Dr. Bomberger thought they should teach he proceeded with few friends and no funds to establish an institution. When ministers seemed to him to have lost the evangelistic note he proceeded to train ministers who would have that note.

Such deeds stamp him a great leader with a great vision. The story of such a life is always well worth reading.

J. W. M.

The publishers of the REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW beg the indulgence of subscribers and readers when the issues of the REVIEW are delayed owing to war conditions. It is hoped that, in the near future, there will be a return to normal conditions.

